

## EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

CONGRATULATIONS ON YOUR  
125TH ANNIVERSARY

HON. DEAN A. GALLO

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 17, 1985

Mr. GALLO. Mr. Speaker, this year marks the 125th anniversary year of the Oheb Shalom Congregation, of South Orange, NJ.

The congregation was founded in 1860, and was one of the seven charter member congregations of the United Synagogue of America, the congregational arm of Judaism's Conservative Movement.

Congregation Oheb Shalom is the second oldest congregation in my State, and the congregation has a very impressive history. Remarkably, nearly 100 members of the present congregation are direct descendants of the founding members of the congregation. The congregation treasures its history, and has maintained an accurate record of its development and its progress.

Recently I was lucky enough to have the history of the congregation forwarded to me by Mr. David Schechner, historian of the congregation.

This history is fascinating. It is the story of a small collection of people who shared a common vision of the future, of the past, and of their role in God's universe. It is the story of growth, commitment and responsibility. It is an understanding of the importance of men and women in all of our endeavors, be they spiritual or secular. Also, it is the story of how progress can be made even after there are differences of opinion.

Certainly, there is much that this body can learn from the congregation's history.

Mr. Speaker, today I would like to present just a portion of this history to my colleagues so that they, too, may have the opportunity to learn from its contents.

## HISTORY OF OHEB SHALOM

The history of Oheb Shalom starts before its birth with the founding of B'Nai Jeshurun in the City of Newark in 1848, at a time when there were less than 200 Jewish families in the City.

B'Nai Jeshurun prospered and grew but as it grew there developed a quarrel within the congregation over whether the congregation should continue to function in what they referred to as the traditional manner or whether they would adopt the Reformed method of worship just as many German congregations were doing. This was a local aspect of what was, in fact, a worldwide argument. In 1869 the argument reached a crescendo at the congregation's annual meeting when the then President, Bernard Hauser, failed in his bid for re-election to the office of the President by one vote and Rabbi Isaac Schwarz, who was a supporter of the views of Mr. Hauser, was not reappointed to his position as Rabbi. The two of

them and many of their adherents resigned their membership and left B'Nai Jeshurun. After some discussions, they determined that they would form a new synagogue where the practices would be similar to the ones that they had established at B'Nai Jeshurun and which were now being abandoned. A meeting was held in the Hauser house on Prince Street and a decision was made to form a new congregation to be called Oheb Shalom. It was also decided that Rabbi Schwarz was to be its first Rabbi. The synagogue was formally incorporated in the Fall of 1860. Dues were established at 36 cents per month, and the new congregation got underway. Services were held on the top floor of a dwelling on the West side of Prince Street, between Springfield Avenue and South Orange Avenue in Newark. Services were what we today call Orthodox and were conducted in Hebrew and German.

The building in which the services were conducted was large enough to have a two-story kind of arrangement; the women sat in the balcony. The men during services, particularly the officers, wore high silk hats. Sermons and instruction were in German which was for all practical purposes the official language of the synagogue even though it had, in fact, ceased to be the language of many of its members. At that time the language and other customs of the synagogues of Newark were determined chiefly by the European heritage of their membership.

Even in those days the vision of Oheb Shalom was broad, far beyond the recitation of prayers. The school was always of prime importance and, while the teachers were volunteers, they were always required to be competent.

As a further service to its membership, the congregation in 1866 bought and started operating the original congregational cemetery on South Orange Avenue.

The little congregation grew slowly but steadily. Members spoke to each other in either German or English, and many were beginning to feel the congregation's official language should be changed to English because that would evidence the ever-growing desire among the members to be more American and more like our neighbors.

Years of growth and change occurred. The congregation built and moved into what was then its brand of new brick edifice on the East side of Prince Street, halfway between Springfield Avenue and South Orange Avenue in the City of Newark. Here there was a gallery but it was used only for overflow worshippers. The records of the congregation appear to indicate that when the congregation moved to the new building on Prince Street, men and women began to sit together.

Rabbi Bernard Drachman, who served from 1885 to 1888, was the last of the European educated German-speaking Rabbis. English became the pulpit vernacular, although according to congregational records, a few times each year as a special treat for old-timers, Rabbi Willner would speak in German which was the language of his forebearers. That kind of practice continued through 1890.

At about that time, Rabbi Gluck became the Rabbi, and presided over what was a great period of expansion in the Prince Street building.

The year 1906 marked a turning point in the history of the congregation. That was the beginning point when the congregation began to move toward what we would call today's Conservative Judaism.

Oheb Shalom at the time numbered among its members more native-born Americans than immigrants. These native-born Americans had a burning desire that was spurred on by Rabbi Charles I. Hoffman and Dr. Solomon Schechter to build new styles and new practices and, yes, new rituals "as Jewish as the Torah and as American as apple pie." The view was popular and the synagogue grew.

It soon became apparent to the officers at that time that neither Prince Street as a locale (it had become the commercial center of the Jewish world of Newark) or the synagogue building itself (it had become overcrowded and much too small) were suitable. In 1907 a decision was made to move and planning and fund-raising began. In quick succession there came the property purchase of the High Street site, building decisions, fund-raising, breaking ground, and finally a cornerstone-laying ceremony for the new building in 1910.

The High Street synagogue building was dedicated in 1911. Among the speakers at what has always been described by those in attendance as an awe-inspiring service were Woodrow Wilson, then Governor of New Jersey and soon to be President of the United States, Solomon Schechter, head of the Jewish Theological seminary and worldwide leader of Conservative Jewry, and Dr. Solomon Solis-Cohen, renowned leader of the Philadelphia Jewish community. The dedication and the mood it generated sparked tremendous activity within the congregation. In that year, the Oheb Shalom Review was created; a synagogue library was installed; the Hebrew School volunteer principal and teachers gave way to professionals.

The programs of the congregation grew during the next ten-year period, and the congregation flourished as few congregations had. At the congregation's 1930 annual meeting, right at the deepest point of the Depression, the congregation burned its mortgage. It had been a nineteen-year financial struggle to do it, and the memory of that struggle coupled with the economic condition of the nation so impressed itself upon the minds of the congregation's leaders that it became an Oheb Shalom principle to say "that's the last of mortgages—never again!" This rule has continued to this very day so that all subsequent improvements and construction has occurred without the use of mortgages.

Rabbi Leon S. Lang joined the congregation in 1927. He was to be Dr. Hoffman's assistant, and his accent was to be on youth. He nurtured the high school which had been started in 1925 and founded the Men's Club which was called Kadimah. He continued the work of emphasizing the congregation's social and educational life.

● This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by the Member of the Senate on the floor.

Boldface type indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.

With the departure of Rabbi Lang, the burden became too great for Rabbi Hoffman and thoughts of his retirement became a reality. Oheb Shalom called to the post Dr. Louis M. Levitsky, who proved to be a dynamo, sparking Oheb Shalom to render even greater service and to be more effective for the benefit of its members and the community. He pushed the congregation so that its name became synonymous with the words "adult education." Our program, which incidentally began in 1911 and was one of the first in the nation, was fine-tuned and expanded under Dr. Levitsky so that it became our most prominent feature.

In the mid-1940s, pressure started building for moving the congregation to the suburbs. Many of the members had moved to the suburbs, and those that remained were moving in increasing numbers. The distance members had to travel for services began to be a topic of discussion.

A substantial percentage of the members of the congregation urged the congregation to move to South Orange, but the majority approached the idea half-heartedly. Sufficient impetus for the move had not yet developed, and several motions on moving the congregation to South Orange, while provoking strong debate, failed to win passage at annual and special meetings.

Eventually a group of the members of Oheb Shalom led by Jennie Beck and Ralph Jacobson gathered a number of their South Orange and Maplewood neighbors and founded Beth El. The circle had become complete. Oheb Shalom, born of B'Nai Jeshurun, now had a daughter congregation of its own.

Pressure kept building for the move to South Orange. The controversy yielded eventually to necessity. In reasonably rapid order, the property at Scotland Road was purchased and plans for the building were prepared. Fund-raising became a major project with the slogan "No fanfare, no pressure, no mortgage." Through this low-key approach, four hundred families met each with the other and raised the one million dollars needed. The building in Newark was sold and all eyes turned to South Orange.

To save the gorgeous Silver Birch tree that stands outside the current building, the building was built as a mirror image of the one drawn by the architect so that the tree could remain. After much discussion, it was determined that the plans would be reversed, and the tree would be saved. The result of this decision is that in many ways the building is the reverse of what was planned.

All of this to save one of God's most beautiful creations—the tree that is outside.

Oheb Shalom showed its devotion to its tradition of continuity in the structure itself: The inscription above the Ark in the main sanctuary is the same one that was over the Ark on High Street, and the inscription on the side of the Ark in the Schechner Chapel is the inscription that appeared carved in stone on the outside of the building on High Street; the eternal light in the Schechner Chapel is the one from the original building on Prince Street; the doors of the High Street Ark are the doors of the Ark in the Schechner Chapel; the memorial tablets that appear in the Founders Hall are in most instances the memorial tablets that were brought from the High Street building; the cornerstone of the High Street building sits in the wall of our building here. Being unable to remove the stained glass windows, replicas of the memorial tab-

lets on those windows were made and are today in Founders Hall.

Groundbreaking ceremonies for the building occurred on May 1, 1957, and the building was advanced sufficiently for a simple ceremony when the cornerstone was put in place in March of 1958. By July, the building was ready and in a moving ceremony the building on High Street was locked with the key that opened it and turned over to the new purchasers. The Torah scrolls were taken by a suitable parade to South Orange and installed in the new edifice over the weekend of July 22, 1958.

Oheb Shalom clearly had arrived and was the prime synagogue in the country. As what seemed to be the height of our activity, Dr. Levitsky advised that he would retire and in 1973 did so. After a search, Rabbi Alexander Shapiro was called to the pulpit and became the Rabbi of the congregation in that year and has recently celebrated his tenth anniversary with us, marked by his election to the presidency of the Rabbinical Assembly. He is the third Rabbi of Oheb Shalom to be so honored.

In 1983 Congregation Beth Torah, which had been established many years before in Orange and had a rich history of its own, found that it was unable to continue to operate at its own building. It sought to merge with another congregation whose philosophical views it shared.

In a moving ceremony, described and performed as if it were a wedding, Beth Torah brought her Torahs to the Ark of Oheb Shalom where they were lovingly accepted and the two congregations became one.

#### HOPES FOR THE FUTURE

It is difficult to compress one hundred and twenty-five years into a few pages. While one hundred and twenty-five years have passed, it is the hope of this important congregation that this period is merely an introduction to the future. We share that hope today.

#### DISTRICT HEATING AND COOLING TAX INCENTIVES

#### HON. JAMES L. OBERSTAR

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 17, 1985

Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Speaker, district heating and cooling, one of the most cost effective and imaginative answers to America's quest for energy independence, was the subject of both the cover story and editorial in the September issue of *Domestic Engineering* magazine. This article is worthy of the attention of our colleagues.

The use of district heating and cooling systems [DHC] has ramifications far beyond the inherent energy efficiency of the systems themselves. Research by the Department of Energy shows that the expanded use of this technology can dramatically reduce oil imports, preserve the vitality of our cities and towns, and stimulate strong local economies.

Studies by the International Energy Agency indicate that if the United States were to begin to shift toward the expanded use of DHC, such a move would create significant additional downward pressure on the world price of oil.

Reduced oil prices have contributed greatly to the rebuilding of our current economic strength. But, think how much more competitive we would become if we reduced our balance of payments by significantly reducing oil imports. Such a move would also provide our domestic industry with less expensive energy at the same time.

Stabilization of the now lopsided balance of payments would not only help our manufacturing sector become more competitive in world markets, it would also help revitalize some of our basic industries such as steel, coal, and railroads.

The installation of citywide district heating and cooling systems will utilize now wasted thermal energy, and can make use of domestic energy resources such as coal, peat, wood waste, and municipal refuse.

The national self-interest mandates the promotion of such technology. But the key to this innovation is to assist the private sector as it gathers the financing needed to construct such systems. I have introduced H.R. 1507 which would clarify the tax and lending laws so such financings would be available.

In a year when tax expenditures are a major topic of discussion in Congress, I would ask my colleagues to recognize two facts as they consider supporting the 15-percent energy investment tax credit contained in H.R. 1507.

First, DHC technology is not experimental or unproven. However, the process of planning and installing these systems in cities is complicated, in the sense that the cooperation of the city government, various State and local agencies, and the building owners in an affected area must all be obtained.

Installing such a system is analogous to installing sewer or waterlines in a town where connection to them is voluntary. Thus the tax credit is needed for a short term to attract investor interest into an area filled with challenges, even though the technology is well known. However, the district heating and cooling industry feels confident that once attention is focused on this area, as the tax credit will do, the progress and examples developed during the period will inspire others to engage in expanding the use of this technology in the future.

I should note at this point that our West European allies have vastly expanded the installation of new district heating systems, particularly since the 1973 oil embargo. Today they use domestic fuels including coal, straw, and peat to heat their cities. We should do the same.

Second, the tax expenditure involved is very modest. Because of the planning time that precedes the actual installation of a system, the industry projects the energy investment tax credit expenditure for a 5-year period following passage of H.R. 1507 to be less than \$100 million.

I am confident that, upon careful consideration of the merits, my colleagues will agree that district heating and cooling is both a modest, and a very prudent invest-



ment in the energy future of our country. I urge their support for inclusion of the provisions of H.R. 1507 into the tax bill currently in markup, and its passage into law. I ask unanimous consent to include, at this point in the RECORD, "District Heating/Cooling, a Key in Energy Independence", and the editorial "District Heating/Cooling: on the Side of the Angels."

**DISTRICT HEATING/COOLING—A KEY IN ENERGY INDEPENDENCE**  
(By Steve Shafer)

Wouldn't it be amazing if we could find a technology that would heat and cool America's urban areas and: Lower our dependence on foreign oil sources; make use of the vast amounts of waste heat from electrical generation plants; or burn garbage, helping eliminate the galloping pollution problems caused by landfills; or use America's abundant supply of coal.

This technology would also cut energy costs for inner cities and military bases; help keep exports competitive by lowering industrial energy costs and create many new jobs in the U.S. rust belt.

A "Star Wars" system, far in the future? No! That "amazing technology" is summed up in the phrase District Heating/Cooling—systems which deliver steam, or hot and chilled water, through piping to buildings in a given "district." America is the home of district heating—the first major system in the world was built in Manhattan in 1881.

Interest declined in these systems after World War II because of tax and investment policies that limited growth and because of pre-occupation with kilowatt production. There are some 3,000 unregulated institutional systems, which have increased in number since 1950. But investor-owned urban systems have decreased—there were 250 in 1951, 59 in 1980. There has been slow growth in municipally-owned systems, due largely to stimulus by HUD and DOE demonstration and grant programs, and some major utilities have recently decided to modernize DHC systems instead of abandoning them. (Consolidated Edison, downtown Manhattan; Hartford, CT; Baltimore Thermal, downtown Baltimore; Pacific Gas & Electric, downtown San Francisco system).

This hardly scratches the surface. The potential value in energy savings is huge. The Department of Energy says: "The technology for district heating and cooling is well understood and there are opportunities to improve system components in ways that would reduce costs . . . If the capital and operating costs of DHC systems can be reduced by 10 to 20 percent, its market potential in the United States could more than double and 2.5 quads of energy, primarily in oil and gas, could be saved over the next 20 years." (These estimates do not include institutional systems, district cooling or non-cogenerating facilities.)

There are more compelling reasons for investing in DHC systems.

Energy Independence. Offshore oil production is down 55 percent this year. "You can't get away from the conclusion that there is less oil than we thought there was, and that has long range implications for the country," says Energy Secretary John S. Herrington. Every year, American consumers pay \$57 billion for energy purchases overseas, weakening the U.S. economy.

"Energy security cannot be viewed only in terms of crude oil available as an improved commodity," the North American District Heating/Cooling Institute says. "If foreign

oil producers will not supply us with oil or natural gas but only with derived products, we become more susceptible to indiscriminate price increases than in the past. While U.S. refineries are being closed down, heavy refinery construction activity is going on overseas. We require diverse domestic fuel and raw material sources in order to avoid being dependent on the import of critical products of many types . . ."

Use of waste heat. Every day the equivalent of more than 20 percent of the nation's river flow is heated with the energy wasted by power plants and industry, plus additional energy is blown into the atmosphere—enough to keep virtually every American home in comfort. DHC systems can make use of this wasted resource.

Fuel flexibility. "This represents district heating and cooling's major advantage over competing energy sources. The ability to use a variety of solid fuels, such as coal and municipal solid waste, allows district heating and cooling systems to offer lower prices. District heating and cooling's primary competition is oil and gas burned in onsite boilers. If district heating and cooling systems can burn cheaper fuels, distinct economic advantages can be realized . . ." From an extensive report by the National Academy of Sciences.

Using coal. America is the "Saudi Arabia of coal," yet the industry is severely depressed. Technology exists for "clean" coal-burning power plants. A proposal of DOE by NADHCI, supported by the American Boiler Mfrs. Assn., would showcase clean coal technologies and stimulate regional revitalization through the development of coal-fired DHC systems.

Increasing export competitiveness. At recent DOE hearings updating the National energy Policy, NADHCI representatives John Patrick, Ameron Corp., Jurgen Kleinau, Keller/Dorr-Oliver and NADHCI president Richard Eckfield stressed the U.S. needs an adequate supply of energy at the lowest possible cost to maintain competitiveness in export markets and maintain and advance the standard of living in the U.S.

"Substantial and sustained growth in gross national product will be virtually impossible without low cost energy and we need this growth in our economy to assure continuing increases in employment." And exporting high technology isn't the ultimate answer.

Job creation. If only 5 percent of U.S. homes, factories, and office buildings were hooked into a district heating and cooling system, \$19 billion in construction and manufacturing employment, \$27 billion in piping and equipment sales, and \$1 billion in domestic fuel sales would be created, according to Stuart W. Temple, new chairman of NADHCI and General Manager of Baltimore Thermal Inc.

Almost everyone who has looked at this problem agrees that sweeping investment, tax and regulatory reforms are necessary.

[From Domestic Engineering, September 1985]

**DISTRICT HEATING/COOLING AND MECHANICAL CONTRACTORS: ON THE SIDE OF THE ANGELS**  
(By Steve Shafer)

After reviewing testimony by members of the North American District Heating and Cooling Institute at Department of Energy hearings held to update the nation's Energy Policy, it's difficult to figure out why DHC systems don't get unquestioned acceptance—and all the breaks the U.S. can deliver.

DHC systems offer big advantages to America: Cutting energy costs for colleges and military bases; burning garbage to produce power and help eliminate poisonous landfills; promoting exports by reducing industrial power costs. Also, not so incidentally for the readers of this magazine DHC systems mean big piping contracts.

Still, NADHCI leaders are involved every day in a major "selling" job in Washington. The pressure to simplify the taxation system is a factor. Across-the-board elimination of such features as tax incentives could rob the nation of the benefits of DHC systems.

Another factor seems to be the notion in high places that the U.S. will become an exporter of "high technology" and investment in basic industries is no longer very important.

Jurgen Kleinau, Keeler Door-Oliver, stressed this point in his testimony before DOE. Kleinau noted that, until 1973, one of the strong reasons for the large U.S. export business was low energy costs.

"Substantial and sustained growth in Gross National Product will be virtually impossible without low-cost energy, and is also necessary to assure continuing increases in employment," Kleinau said.

"High technology will not be the ultimate answer because it is a service activity and cannot be self-serving. High technology will serve primarily the manufacturing industries, who in turn can grow only when low-cost energy is available . . ."

NADHCI recommends a series of steps necessary to make full use of DHC systems, many of which are contained in a bill introduced by Representative James Oberstar (DFL-MN) and endorsed by MCAA.

Every mechanical contractor in the country ought to understand and get behind Congressman Oberstar's bill. As so often happens, mechanical contractors have a chance to be on the side of the Angels—and brighten their business prospects at the same time.

**LET'S LOOK BEFORE WE LEAP**

**HON. JACK FIELDS**

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 17, 1985

Mr. FIELDS. Mr. Speaker, a dark cloud is looming on America's horizon. A worldwide trade war is brewing, waiting to unleash its economic fury across every continent.

As Members of Congress, we must recognize not only the gravity of the current trade imbalance but the gravity of the actions we may take in response. I am not advocating sitting idly by while our trade deficit rises. But, we must act with extreme care and forethought, ever conscious that repeating the protectionist policies of Smoot-Hawley will bring that ominous black cloud rolling across our Nation and the world.

Mr. Speaker, let's "look before we leap" into trade protectionism. In that spirit, I commend to my colleagues the following insightful remarks by a man of great stature, Mr. Jack Rains. Chairman of 3/D International, a Houston design and management firm, Jack is a prominent Houston

businessman, a renowned civic leader and a frequent lecturer on international trade.

The article follows:

"TRADE WAR: AMERICA ON THE BRINK"  
(October 1, 1985)

At first we heard "the United States has a trade problem," then it became apparent we had more than a problem—we face a crisis. Many fear headlines will soon read, "America in Trade War."

The United States has not enjoyed a positive balance in merchandise trading in 10 years. Until recently the current account, or the account which reflects our total trade balance, was positive. But since 1975, like the popular song says, "we're rolling downhill like a snowball headed for hell." We suffer devastating trade deficits. Further, we have become a debtor nation. Now domestic political pressures demand protectionist legislation—if granted it could well plunge the U.S. into a desperate trade war.

Three major root causes have created this crisis: First, an overvalued or "strong dollar," second, unfair trade practices by our trading partners; and finally, America's private sector, in all too many cases, is not prepared to meet international competition. Let's examine each area separately:

#### DISADVANTAGE FROM A STRONG DOLLAR

The strong dollar is by far our biggest trade problem. Since 1969, when the Federal Reserve Board, in an effort to fight inflation, jacked up interest rates, the U.S. dollar has increased steadily in value. The resulting high yields, plus the safety offered by the U.S. investment climate, resulted in a flood of offshore funds seeking investment opportunities in this country. Predictably, the dollar rose against other currencies. Simultaneously the U.S. Congress dramatically increased deficit spending.

That in turn forced the U.S. Government to increase borrowing to cover the cost of the deficit. Increased demand created fierce competition for funds with borrowers from the private sector from Third World governments. Inevitably too much demand was chasing too few dollars. No one should have been surprised when interest rates rose. In reaction, the dollar soared above other currencies. Predictably the United States began to experience trade problems; as U.S. goods were overpriced for export, imports became bargains—all due to the over-valued dollar.

Most experts agree that two-thirds of the U.S. trade problems today can be traced to government policy creating a strong dollar. Simply stated, the overvalued U.S. dollar prices U.S. goods and services out of the world's markets and lowers the price of imports. America's offerings are overpriced by 30%—that is a severe disadvantage.

The debilitating impact on the ability of U.S. businesses to export or compete with imports at home has resulted in a catastrophic trade imbalance. As exports fell and imports increased, the two combined to inflict pain on many American businesses and workers. This is a bad situation we must remedy. But remember, the overvalued or "strong dollar" is only two-thirds of the problem. Trade practices are also a culprit.

#### UNFAIR TRADE PRACTICES

The trade practices of our trading partners disadvantage American business. The United States believes in "free trade;" we must insist, however, that our trading partners practice "fair trade." Japan is a "worst case" example.

We grant Japanese businesses virtually total access to U.S. markets. But despite

Japanese posturing to the contrary and repeated assurances of "good faith efforts," the bottom-line results are clear. Neither the United States, nor any other country's products and services for that matter, can significantly penetrate the Japanese domestic market.

It is reminiscent of the U.S. civil rights debate; whether de facto or de jure, the results are the same. The burden is on the Japanese to address and solve their patently unfair practices. Time is running out. Japan's continued failure to restore a balance of trade can only lead to cataclysmic results. We are on the brink of a disastrous trade war.

When reviewing United States-Japanese relations, consider the allocation of the United States and Japan of their Gross National Product (GNP) to defense and trade subsidies.

The Japanese spend 1% of their GNP on defense. In contrast, the United States spends 6.7% of their GNP on defense. The Japanese depend on a security umbrella provided by the U.S. military to protect the sea lanes so critical to Japan's survival. Meanwhile, the Japanese invest the money saved on defense spending to subsidize their industries, undercutting other countries in competition for international trade. Japan spends more than twice as much as the United States on trade subsidies.

While there is great alarm in America over the direct trade imbalance between the United States and Japan, that is merely the tip of the iceberg. The American taxpayer should be more concerned, even alarmed, over the effect of Japanese and United States policy on trading opportunities in the developing areas of the world, particularly the Pacific Rim.

Today the most promising area for future growth and trade opportunities exists in the Pacific Rim. The nations in that region are growing at a far faster rate than the rest of the world. Japan is moving to dominate that market . . . United States influence and business opportunities for U.S. firms are systematically excluded. Our government must address such fundamental problems. American business must not be placed at a disadvantage because of government intervention when competing with businesses of other countries. It is the U.S. Government's responsibility to see that the trade game is played fairly.

The European Economic Community (EEC) also takes a few cheap shots at Uncle Sam. Take for example the EEC practice of buying sugar at \$0.27 per pound, providing farmers with an artificially high income, thus encouraging over-production. The EEC then dumps that sugar on the world market at \$0.06 per pound. Such predatory trade practices have grievously injured the sugar industry in the United States.

We must demand that the Executive Branch of the U.S. Government—the President and his Cabinet—move decisively and promptly to level the field of competition.

The U.S. competitive stance is a problem. We can not blame all of our problems on the United States and foreign governments. The hands of American management and labor are far from clean. In the United States we have been living off the advantage we enjoyed following World War II. We dominated the world economically at that time, possessing the only economy not devastated by the war. While the United States grew fat, we tolerated special interest—business and labor—that today exacerbates our trade problems.

We lost in some cases, and surely handicapped in far too many others, our ability to compete in basic industries. We ignored the fact that our nation is no longer self-sufficient. We must import oil and other vital resources. In the 40 years since World War II the world has changed. Today Europe and Japan are competing with the United States on equal footing if not at an advantage. We must be competitive. America must trade successfully to survive.

The current posted productivity gains in manufacturing underscores our eroding competitive position. The United States gained 3.5% in productivity last year, while Germany moved up 4.7%, France 5% and Japan a whopping 9.5% or almost 3 times the U.S. gain. Our disadvantage grows.

Organized labor demands high wages and fights automation which would increase productivity. U.S. management asks for protection from foreign competition. When granted it allows sheltered U.S. businesses to gouge the American consumer for inflated profits. Worse yet, the management teams of those most favored businesses take their ill-gotten gains, and instead of reinvesting in new plants and equipment to improve productivity and America's competitive stance, they follow the example of steel and autos, and diversify into unrelated industries like computing and real estate.

Basic U.S. industries must become competitive. The auto industry is a classic example of how the U.S. Government's protectionist policy is counter-productive.

Japanese automobiles require significantly fewer hours to produce in comparison with their U.S. counterparts. The cost of Japanese labor is substantially lower than the U.S. rate. The American public ranks the Japanese automobile superior to its U.S. competitor. When a product costs less, and is of better quality, clearly protectionist legislation preventing imports only serves to perpetuate Detroit's inferiority. Protectionism is not in America's best interest. Surely Congress can understand and embrace such a simple truth.

Steel is another grim case. The American steel worker is paid more than twice the wage of the average U.S. manufacturing worker. Yet, his productivity is less than that of his European or Asian counterpart. However, through U.S. government imposed quotas, we ensure that all steel available in America, whether domestic or imported, will be over-priced. The resulting ripple effect throughout our economy, when that overly expensive steel is used in products, ensures that we handicap the competitiveness of all American merchandise.

Every product produced is over-priced. Did you ever stop to ask how Japan can import 100% of its oil, 100% of its iron ore, yet produce and deliver steel to the U.S. at a cost below U.S. steel. Contrast those circumstances with our own. We enjoy abundant iron ore, an abundant supply of domestic energy, and U.S. steel bears no transportation burden from Japan. It is a scathing indictment of management and labor in the U.S. steel industry. There is more than enough blame for everyone for our trade mess.

"OK—so it's a real crisis," then why you ask, shouldn't we demand that our government protect our domestic industries and otherwise engage in trade practices designed to eliminate foreign competition? That would certainly be appealing to steel, autos and the labor and management teams of many other non-competitive industries. It is also a dangerous move. Protectionism is like



dope: seductive, deadly and destructive for everyone even remotely involved.

#### PROTECTIONISM: THE POISONED PILL

Protectionism is expensive, counter-productive and dangerous. I will prove each point of that statement:

#### THE COST OF PROTECTIONISM

First let's focus on the cost of protectionism. Again autos provide a clear-cut case study. When Detroit complained it could not meet foreign competition, labor and management of this powerful industry joined forces to pressure the U.S. Government to negotiate "voluntary" import quotas with the Japanese. The Japanese are no fools; they saw an opportunity for huge profit. All parties agreed to the quotas—well, almost everyone—no matter, soon the Japanese began shipping high-priced, fully-loaded models to the U.S. market.

With supply reduced, those more expensive units sold quickly and the profits of the Japanese automakers soared. With foreign competition diminished the profits of the U.S. automakers rose. Everyone was happy . . . well, almost everyone. The only real loser was the poor old American consumer. As a result of this "cozy quota" arrangement, the U.S. consumer paid billions of dollars in premiums to purchase autos. Yes; that's right billions of dollars over the real world market price. Say "thank you" to your nice Uncle Sam. Windfall profits went right into the pockets of the Japanese and U.S. automakers.

Sure we saved some American jobs, but look at the cost; for each auto worker's job saved the U.S. consumer paid an additional \$240,000. I'll bet those "saved auto workers" would have preferred to take that loot in a termination bonus. Remember that the next time you see Lee Iacocca wrapped in a flag and condemning imports. He is not nearly as glamorous a figure when you realize he's like a carnival huckster . . . distracting us while he picks our pockets. Those extra billions of dollars came out of the pockets of American workers.

It is the same story in other industries. For every job we save with tariffs or quotas it cost the U.S. consumer. How much? Well, \$114,000 in the case of each steel worker, \$60,000 for the shoemaker, \$24,000 for a tuna fisherman and \$43,000 for each textile job. I think it is clear the U.S. consumer, "the price is not right."

All Americans—workers and consumers—must realize the times and circumstances have changed. Make no mistake, it's a tragedy when anyone loses a job, when communities are wrenched and forced to adjust to structural changes in the world economy. However, as a nation competing for global markets, America must use her resources prudently. We should re-train and when forced to, relocate workers.

It is unconscionable to ask the American consumer to pick up the tab for futile attempts by posturing politicians to perpetuate the past; change is inevitable. Why, if the ideas some congressional leaders are advocating today had been adopted at the turn of the century, we would still have hundreds of thousands of people turning out horseshoes and harnesses. American industry and American workers have always changed with the times. It is the same today, we must adapt to change—we must meet competition.

#### PROTECTIONISM IS COUNTER-PRODUCTIVE

When we protect our weak industries, other countries retaliate. In the end no one wins a trade war.

Our economy has some great strengths. The United States enjoys a "comparative advantage" over competing countries in such areas as agriculture, aircrafts, high-tech industry, medicine and services of all types. In fact, services are the fastest growing segment of the U.S. economy and account for one-third of all U.S. exports. Strong industries such as those compete successfully in the world market, earning valuable balance of trade credits for the U.S. economy. If we enact protectionist barriers to protect weak industries, our trading partners will retaliate. And they will retaliate against the strong, competitive segments of our economy.

Protectionism does not save jobs, it just reshuffles jobs to our over-all disadvantage. Protectionism bleeds the strong, but worst of all, it guarantees that the weak will never become competitive. Protectionism is like dope; once hooked it's all downhill. Protectionism is a "lose, lose" strategy. Fair, free trade is a "win, win" strategy. Increased exports create jobs—imports ensure lower prices for quality goods benefitting all Americans.

Those who ignore history are doomed to repeat it. God help America if we did not learn from the tragedy of the Smoot-Hawley Act. That ill-conceived piece of legislation in the late 1920's erected high tariffs in a move designed to protect American industry. While popular at the time, the results were tragic. True, imports fell from 4.8 billion in 1929, to 1.7 billion in 1932, but at the same time exports were falling from 5.4 billion to 2.4 billion during the same period. The Great Depression resulted. America recovered after paying a terrible price in human suffering and, finally, in enduring World War II.

Today, as was the case in the late 1920's, debtor nations who owe their debts in U.S. currency must earn dollars to make repayment. When we restrict imports we deprive a country of the ability to earn the necessary dollars. We insure that those nations will default on their debt. Ask any banker what would happen should foreign debtors default on their payment to U.S. banks. First, make sure he is sitting down.

We are more fortunate. American owes her debts in U.S. dollars. That is a great advantage. Charles de Gaulle complained of our "arrogance" because of the U.S. ability to borrow in our own currency. Sorry Charlie, but there are few advantages left for ol' Uncle Sam.

While other nations must earn dollars to pay their debts, the U.S. Government controls the supply of dollars. I would rather America be a debtor nation owing dollars, than destroy other nations' ability to earn dollars to repay their debts . . . particularly to American banks.

Free trade is the only solution. Protectionism only reshuffles jobs and destroys our competitive advantage in those areas of our export economy where America enjoys a comparative advantage. Protectionism is a serious threat to the American banking system. Protectionism is a "dangerous drug" threatening the health of the world economy.

#### WHAT IS THE ANSWER?

We did not get into this mess overnight, so we can expect easy, simple, "quick fixes." We must fight this battle simultaneously on three fronts. It is a struggle we can not afford to lose. Let's focus separately on each ingredient in the prescription for a healthy America.

#### FIRST YOU HAVE TO GET THE MULE'S ATTENTION

A farmer once bragged his mules would respond to his whispered commands. His neighbor added, "True, but first he hits them upside the head to get their attention." We face a similar challenge.

The first and most critical step is that we demand that Congress address the problems of the U.S. Government's deficits and the over-valued U.S. dollar. Only Congress can bring down deficits; they control spending and revenue. Who submits what budget is merely political posturing—a smoke screen. Congress controls income and expenses. We, the people, must insist that Congress face its responsibilities. Our elected representatives must either raise taxes, cut spending or utilize a combination of the two . . . the latter probably a more realistic tack. In all events, only Congress has the power to bring deficits down. A reduction in deficit spending will cause the dollar to stabilize at a competitive rate. Only when the dollar is realistically aligned with other currencies can American business compete in world markets. No one can successfully compete at a 30% disadvantage which is what American business is asked to do today.

Congress and Congress alone, must address that fundamental problem. We must raise unmitigated hell until they act; you know how to get their attention.

The Reagan administration recently announced plans to intervene in monetary markets in an attempt to lower the value of the dollar. Intervention cannot be relied upon for permanent relief. President Carter's administration committed over \$20 billion annually to monetary intervention with poor results. Today money markets ringing the world never close. These markets have a daily volume exceeding \$150 billion. In the face of that torrent of funds, I fear all the king's horses and all the king's men can not bring the dollar down against the Yen. It is a little like spitting in the ocean; you can't expect to effect the level of the tide.

We can realistically expect the dollar to properly align itself only after Congress acts to reduce deficits, and move toward balanced budgets. Enacting the law recently proposed by Senator Phil Gramm, which would require balanced budgets in five years, would bring huge benefits. While President Reagan's and Secretary Baker's efforts are to be applauded and perhaps will provide short term relief, don't bet the family farm on the long term results.

Congress isn't the only "one stubborn as a mule." Some of our trading partners are refusing to budge. It is past time for the Executive Branch of the U.S. Government to gain their attention and engage in candid talks. We must have "fair trade." Other countries must see that Uncle Sam does not blink when he demands equal access to their domestic markets. More importantly, we must insist that other nations compete with us fairly for business in the developing nations, particularly those of the Pacific Rim.

The American taxpayer can not pay for the defense of other nations, and in turn, allow those economic "draft dodgers" to subsidize their industries to American disadvantage. Remember every time a railroad is built, a project air-conditioned, an elevator installed, a TV or communication system designed and built in a developing nation by any other industrial nation except the U.S.A., it becomes their market for replacement and add-ons for the next 30 or more years.

That is the advantage the United States gained following World War II. Today America's competitors are building the same advantage in the most rapidly growing parts of the world. We can not mortgage our children's future; America must compete on a level field. Our government must see to it that our trading partners play fair.

**AMERICAN BUSINESS—MANAGEMENT AND  
LABOR—MUST BE COMPETITIVE**

Government can not do it all; American management and labor must also play a key role. Consumers must unite and demand that our elected representatives muster the political courage to tell powerful special interest groups, "you must meet world competition," and "you must do so in a short period of time." Everyone must understand they will not be protected from change. We can not subsidize the inefficient; the obsolete. When jobs are lost we must re-train and, if necessary, even assist in relocating workers.

It is clear we can no longer ask the American consumer to subsidize a lack of competitiveness. Consumers must demand that Congress reject unrealistic demands. Restricting imports costs us all. America is in transition. Change is unsettling, even threatening, and it can cause pain. But inevitably change must be accommodated. We can do it—America is a winner.

**GUN REGISTRATION—THE TIME  
HAS COME FOR ACTION**

**HON. JAMES A. TRAFICANT, JR.**

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 17, 1985

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express my concern over the lack of adequate constraints and controls over the sale of firearms. I want to make it clear that I am a strong supporter of the right to bear arms. I would fight against any effort to deny law-abiding Americans that right. But this Nation's disgraceful homicide rate at the hands of guns is so alarmingly high, that I feel some action is necessary.

As a former sheriff, I can attest to the fact that some form of gun registration would be helpful to police and would go a long way in tackling violent crime in this Nation. I have introduced legislation, H.R. 2570, that I feel is a necessary step in the right direction.

H.R. 2570 would require that States, in order to receive Federal Criminal Justice Block Grants, enact firearms registration laws. These laws must require that all firearms be registered with local law enforcement agencies—making it a criminal penalty for failure to do so. States would also have to make it a criminal penalty to obliterate, remove, or alter the manufacturer's or importer's serial number on a firearm.

Under this bill, gunowners can keep their guns and own as many as they want. All I am saying is they must at least register them with local police officials. Many people in this country are firmly against any form of gun registration—claiming it is a direct violation of the right to bear arms and that it will lead to the eventual confiscation of firearms. This is simply not true. I believe that law-abiding gunowners

would have no problem registering their weapons with local police. More importantly, I believe that some action is necessary to put some type of handle on the gross number of violent deaths in this country. One cannot ignore the grim statistics.

For example, in 1980 there were 11,522 handgun homicides in the United States. That same year there were only 77 handgun homicides in Japan; a mere 8 in Great Britain; 24 in Switzerland; 8 in Canada; 18 in Sweden; and 4 in Australia. Not surprisingly except for the United States, all of these countries require some form of gun registration. And the statistics haven't gotten any better here in America. In 1983, the FBI reported that there were over 9,000 homicides committed with firearms. We cannot afford to ignore these statistics. Sure, stiffer laws are needed against those who commit violent crime. I strongly support such initiatives. But as a former sheriff, I recognize the fact that fighting crime is a war that must be fought on many fronts. Firearm registration is a front that can no longer be overlooked.

I feel that my bill, H.R. 2570, deserves close consideration. Some opponents of gun registration have raised the concern that such an initiative would impose a burden on taxpayers. Not true. A revealing assessment of California's handgun control initiative—a gun registration measure—conducted by Duke University in 1982, uncovered some interesting facts. The study showed that registration of guns would impose only negligible costs on taxpayers. The study also revealed that the processing time of such an initiative would be less than 15 days if only the State criminal records are checked. My bill provides States with the leeway to develop their gun registration laws and programs. The Duke University study clearly shows that, if done correctly, States can implement a gun registration program that works, that is not burdensome to taxpayers, and does not infringe upon the right of law-abiding citizens to bear arms.

At this time, Mr. Speaker, I would like to submit into the RECORD an editorial that appeared in the October 16, 1985 edition of the Cleveland Plain Dealer. I urge all of my colleagues to read it:

[From the Cleveland Plain Dealer, Oct. 16, 1985]

**ONE GUN IN FIVE**

A recent Justice Department survey of more than 1,800 felons ("serious, long-term offenders") found that one in five obtained handguns through "customary retail channels." Two of five acquired their guns from relatives or friends. The rest went to the black market or used other illegitimate means to get their weapons. The National Rifle Association says this shows the ineffectiveness of gun control.

The NRA is accustomed to refractive, prismatic logic. That's how it can use a survey showing that retail gun sales are a major source of criminals' weapons to argue against greater regulation of such sales. Smoking is only one cause of cancer, therefore smoking isn't a health risk. You've never had an automobile accident, ergo, you don't need a driver's license.

Even presuming that all the friends and relatives who provided weapons to criminals got their guns illegally, 20% still is too high a figure to justify gun-control obstinacy. And even presuming that criminals are going to get weapons regardless of stern gun control, 20% is too large a figure to write off. To the contrary, that one gun in five is compelling evidence of the need for tight gun laws.

Gun controls needn't work a hardship on law-abiding toters. Registration and licensing won't hinder their pursuits. Waiting periods won't chill the legitimacy of their desire, nor seriously impede their pleasure. But tough laws might reduce the number of felons with legally acquired guns to one out of 10—maybe even one out of 20. Especially if such legislation is tied to restraints on the manufacture and sale of Saturday Night Specials.

This nation doesn't need surveys to make a case for tighter controls. It witnesses handgun killings every day of the year. Rather, it needs local, state and national leaders willing to recognize the NRA's distortive perceptions for what they are—atastic constitutional delusions. Unlike legally acquired criminal weapons, such lawmakers are fewer than one out of five.

**SOVIET CAMPAIGN OF  
DISINFORMATION**

**HON. ROBERT J. LAGOMARSINO**

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 17, 1985

Mr. LAGOMARSINO. Mr. Speaker, on July 17 of this year, I rose along with several of my colleagues to discuss the dangerous threat to Western, particularly United States security interests posed by the Soviet Union's covert operations programs, known as "active measures."

Certainly, as recent events have dramatically proven, Soviet covert operations and activities against the United States are on the rise. One particularly challenging component of the Soviet "active measures" campaign is disinformation.

One of my constituents, Jack Mathews, has written an informative article entitled, "The Soviet Disinformation Juggernaut." Jack was formerly with the Central Intelligence Agency, and has received several awards and medals for his fine performance in this capacity.

As the threat we face from Soviet subversion and "active measures"—including disinformation—has certainly not diminished over the last few years, the Mathews article is timely and instructive, and I commend it to my colleagues' attention.

[From Gung-Ho Magazine, March 1984]

**THE SOVIET DISINFORMATION JUGGERNAUT**

(By Jack Mathews)

Organized deceit has always played a major role in the planning and conduct of the Soviet Union's foreign policy, and is known as disinformation by the Soviet's intelligence services. The word "disinformation" is not in our dictionaries; it comes from the Russian word "dezinformatsiya," which means a deliberate effort to mislead your opponent on your real intentions.



The Soviet intelligence services, the KGB and the GRU, through the use of disinformation operations, place distortions and lies in the U.S. and European media in such a way to mislead the American people and to influence U.S. foreign military, and economic policy in a manner favorable to the Soviet Union. The Soviets also undertake disinformation activities in support of international terrorist organizations, communist-inspired insurgency movements in the Third World, and the international movement to induce the U.S. to undertake a unilateral nuclear freeze.

The ruthless murder of 269 men, women, and children on board Korean Airlines flight 007, shot down on orders from the Kremlin by a Soviet SU-15 fighter plane over the Sea of Japan, shocked the whole world. Within hours of the act, however, the Soviets commenced to utilize their worldwide disinformation capability to place blame for this Soviet-sponsored atrocity on the United States. Soviet and Bloc country media claimed that "The KAL 747 was on a spy mission for the U.S., that its profile was the same as that of a U.S. RC-135 reconnaissance plane, and that it was flying with its lights out." Regardless of proof the U.S. and Japan can place before the United Nations, demonstrating without a shadow of a doubt that the KAL 747 was shot down in cold blood on orders from the Kremlin, the Soviets will never admit they are guilty of this barbaric act.

Over the next several weeks and months, certain segments of the U.S. and western media can be expected to support the Soviet claims that "The responsibility for the loss of the KAL 747 lies with the U.S. because of its provocative intrusions of Soviet airspace on spy missions using RC-135s and other military aircraft." Most U.S. and Western "Kremlinologists" believe U.S. and Japanese intelligence which established that the Soviets tracked the KAL 747 on radar for more than two hours, which lends credence to the surmise that the Kremlin gave the order, "Shoot to kill." Edward Luttwak of the Georgetown University Center for Strategic and International Studies has stated that "I have never known of (lower-level Soviet officials) deciding on something that can be referred all the way up, and in this case they had the time and opportunity to refer it all the way up to (Yuri) Andropov."

The best-selling novel *The Spike*, written by two well-known journalists, describes how Soviet intelligence services conduct disinformation operations in the U.S. and other Western countries. Until the publication of *The Spike* in 1980, there was very little known in the public sector about the massive Soviet disinformation program, because U.S. and European intelligence services were reluctant to bring it to the attention of the public for reasons of their own.

In 1959, General Ivan Ivanovich Agayants established a new clandestine organization within the KGB's headquarters, known as the Disinformation Department or Department D. It has recently been estimated by Suzanne Labin, as French authority on Soviet intelligence and disinformation operations, that the KGB was spending over \$2 billion annually and supporting several hundred thousand people on disinformation outside the USSR as agents, fomenters, travelers, or active sympathizers.

KGB disinformation activities conducted in the U.S. involve such clandestine devices as forgeries of official government documents, planted articles in newspapers and magazines, bribery of media representatives, and funding of so-called liberal think tanks.

The main objectives and topics of the Soviet disinformation activities change as new international problems and issues arise. However, one thing that does not shift is the fact that the main thrust of the massive disinformation operations conducted by the KGB are always targeted against the Main Enemy ("glavnyy protivnik"), the United States of America. In recent Congressional investigations into KGB operations in the U.S. a high CIA official listed the following as major goals of the Soviet disinformation campaign:

To influence world public opinion against U.S. military and political programs perceived as threatening to the Soviet Union;

To isolate the U.S. from its allies and friends;

To discredit those who cooperate with the U.S. (even communist countries such as China);

To discredit and weaken Western intelligence services and to expose their personnel;

To demonstrate that the policies and objectives of the U.S. are incompatible with the ambitions of the underdeveloped or "Third World" countries;

To create and maintain a favorable environment for the conduct of Soviet foreign policy worldwide;

To confuse world public opinion regarding the highly aggressive nature of a broad range of Soviet foreign-policy objectives.

In July 1982, the House of Representatives' Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence conducted extensive hearings on the KGB's disinformation, or active measures, operations carried on in the U.S. Stanislav Levchenko, a recent defector from the KGB, provided the committee with a firsthand account of his own disinformation activities on behalf of the Soviets. One of Levchenko's most startling disclosures concerned the fact that millions of dollars in cash are carried into the U.S. by KGB officials serving in the Soviet UN Mission, and the Soviet Embassy in Washington, D.C. These funds are used to support KGB intelligence collection and disinformation operations in the U.S.

In testimony before the House Committee on Intelligence, in February 1980, Ladislav Bittman, a former deputy chief of the Disinformation Department of the Czechoslovak Intelligence service, outlined his own successful efforts to plant disinformation in the U.S. and European media. (The disinformation activities of East European and Cuban intelligence services are under the direct control of the KGB.) Bittman told the Committee, "If somebody had at this moment the magic key that would open the safes of Soviet Bloc intelligence services and looked into the files of secret agents operating in Western countries, he would be surprised to find that a relatively high percentage of these agents are journalists. A journalist operating in Britain, West Germany, or in the U.S. is a great asset to Soviet intelligence. It is his job to acquire important, even highly sensitive information in addition to his role in placing KGB disinformation articles in the media. This is particularly true in the U.S. with its tradition of an aggressive adversary press."

Liya Dzhirkevlov, who defected from the KGB in 1980, operated in Africa and Western Europe as a correspondent for the Soviet publication *Novosti*. Dzhirkevlov was interviewed in London in 1981 by the editor of the American Bar Association's magazine, *Intelligence Report*. He declared that "The KGB is only the arm, the tool, the perform-

ing force in disinformation operations. The goals for disinformation are set, the targets are chosen, and the plans made only by the 'apparatus' and the Secretariat of the CPSU's central committee, the nine men who run the Soviet Union."

Dzhirkevlov also said, "The KGB supported and sponsored 'national liberation' movements in Africa, Asia, Latin America, and even European (Ireland) countries. Prominent in this category is the Palestinian Liberation Organization." He claimed that in the Soviet training of "fighters" for the PLO and other "movements," active assistance is sought (and received) from Bulgarian, East German, and Cuban intelligence services. Dzhirkevlov reported that urban guerrillas are trained on Soviet territory, and now in several African states like Angola, Mozambique, and Libya.

On 13 May 1981, Mehmet Ali Agca, a 23-year-old Turk, shot and nearly killed Pope John Paul II in St. Peter's Square in Rome. Just hours after the Pope was shot, front-page stories around the world described Agca as a "fascist thug" and a member of Turkey's neo-Nazi Gray Wolves. The media presumed that the Gray Wolves had sent Agca to Rome to kill the Pope or that he was a right-wing crackpot working on his own. As we now know, Agca was not a member of the Gray Wolves, and he did not work alone in his attempt to murder the Pope. Even NBC, in a recent TV Special Report, documented in great detail Agca's contacts with Bulgarian intelligence officers. The September 1982 edition of *Reader's Digest* carried a very informative article on Agca's Bulgarian and Soviet connections prior to his attack on the Pope. Agca declared on international TV in July 1983, outside of a Rome courtroom, that he was directed against the Pope by the Bulgarians and the KGB.

The majority of the U.S. and Western media are intent on ignoring the now-proven connection agents of Bulgarian and Soviet intelligence had with Agca, even though he has openly exposed his contacts with personnel of these services.

Philip Agee, the CIA's first known ideological defector and whose close contact with Soviet and Cuban intelligence services in Europe, where he has resided since his defection in 1970, is well-known to all Western intelligence services. He is considered by the KGB to be one of its most effective disinformation agents.

In early 1981, Agee held a press conference in West Germany and provided the international media representatives with copies of his 46-page analysis of the U.S. State Department's "White Paper" on Soviet and Cuban support of the communist insurgents in El Salvador. His critique of the administration's "White Paper" charged that all the evidence of purported Soviet support to the Salvadoran insurgents was fabricated. Agee claimed that "The white paper turned out to be a total fraud and simply a pretext to fool Americans into thinking the Cubans and Soviets were behind the civil war in El Salvador." Agee's allegations, provided by the KGB, were avidly carried by a large number of international news services. In June 1981 both the *Wall Street Journal* and the *Washington Post* published articles questioning the validity of the administration's "White Paper on El Salvador." Neither of these papers made any reference to the fact that Agee was the primary source of these articles. In a front-page interview with a correspondent of the *Los Angeles Herald Examiner*, carried

on 1 July 1981, Agee stated, "You may have seen news dispatches in February, and as recent as a couple of weeks ago in the *Wall Street Journal* and the *Washington Post*. All of this reporting was based on my analysis of the State Department white paper."

Andrei D. Sakharov, the Soviet dissident, is a hero to liberals in the Western World. His political testament was smuggled out of his KGB-imposed exile in his own country and was published as a cover story in the *New York Times Magazine* on 8 June 1980. Dr. Sakharov cites the categories of disinformation agents who are busy promoting Soviet "expansionist objectives" in Western governments, parliaments, business and news organizations. Among them, Sakharov listed "a great many writers and journalists."

In 1981, James L. Tyson, an economist and journalist, published *Target America*, a non-fiction expose of Soviet disinformation operations conducted in this country by the KGB. Tyson's book documents in great detail what a good number of journalists in the U.S. and Europe have known for many years, i.e., this country is the target of a massive and frighteningly successful Soviet disinformation campaign which is aided by a host of knowing and unwitting journalists and important media organs. Tyson's book has uncovered important new insights on the KGB's recruiting tactics, the amount of time and funds expended on disinformation activities, and the army of unwitting "sympathizers" in the media who are being manipulated to support Soviet foreign-policy objectives without their knowing it.

Tyson has cited what he terms the "Far Left Lobby," which is composed of think tanks ostensibly engaged in research and publishing but are also highly active in the sponsorship of conferences and seminars. They brief Congress and the executive departments and, in fact, become involved with more activist roles in lawsuits or even mass demonstrations. The most important of these think tanks is the tax-exempt Institute for Policy Studies located in Washington, D.C. The IPS was founded in 1963 and presently has an estimated budget of more than \$2 million a year. The IPS has evolved into the operational center of a truly revolutionary political network operating at the national and international levels. The declared goal of the IPS' multifaceted program, both overt and covert, is the radical transformation of America's basic intellectual, religious, economic, and political institutions. The IPS is involved in disinformation operations in just about all phases of its well-funded efforts to bring about radical changes in our society. The IPS has some 10 subsidiary operations that in turn influence and shape a whole series of independent groups.

The April 26, 1981, edition of the *New York Times* magazine carried an article by Joshua Muravchik, entitled "The Think Tank of the Left," which provided an excellent insight on the IPS. The *Times*' article on the IPS represented the first attempt by a major liberal publication to take a critical look at an organization that is now 20 years old. What seemed to intrigue Muravchik and the *New York Times* executives who commissioned the article was the mounting evidence that the Institute for Policy Studies is aligned with those forces, at home and abroad, that are trying to impose a "Socialist" or Marxist system on the United States and other countries.

Muravchik pointed out that on defense and foreign-policy matters, a number of IPS

officials have voiced support for communist regimes such as Cuba and North Vietnam and revolutionary movements in Africa, Central America, and the Middle East. He also noted that the IPS facilitated CIA defector Philip Agee's travel in Europe.

The April 9, 1983, edition of *Human Events*, *The National Conservative Weekly* (published in Washington, D.C.) carried an eight-page special supplement entitled "The IPS and the Media: Unholy Alliance." The *Human Events* article on the IPS is the most interesting and informative study of the extensive impact the IPS and its subsidiary organizations have on the U.S. press and TV networks that has been published in this country. One of the most important segments of the article deals with two West Coast media operations funded "under the table" by the IPS. They are *Mother Jones*, a monthly political review in magazine format, and the Pacific News Service.

*Mother Jones*, named "pioneer socialist" Mary Harris "Mother" Jones, is published by the tax-exempt Foundation for National Progress, which claimed in its 1976 financial report that it was established on the West Coast to carry out the "charitable and educational activities of the IPS." It appears that in its July 1983 edition, *Mother Jones* "blew its cover" by featuring an 11-page article, with a photograph of Pope John Paul II, entitled "Is the CIA Splitting His Church?" written by Martin A. Lee. In his article on the Catholic Church and every Pope since Pope Pius XII, Lee made the following charges:

Since World War II, the CIA has: Subsidized a Catholic lay organization that served as the political slugging arm of the pope and the Vatican throughout the Cold War;

Penetrated the American section of one of the wealthiest and most powerful Vatican orders;

Passed money to a large number of priests and bishops, some of whom became knowing agents in CIA covert operations;

Employed undercover operatives to lobby members of the Curia (the Vatican government) and spy on liberal churchmen on the pope's staff who challenged the political assumptions of the United States.

Lee's article is especially critical of Pope John Paul II and implies that the CIA indirectly had a hand in the selection of the "Polish Pope" through contacts in Opus Dei, a fast-growing Catholic lay society. He claims that Opus Dei's political activities are shrouded in secrecy. The absolute irony of Lee's article in *Mother Jones* is the fact that the charges he makes regarding purported links between the Vatican and the CIA, over the past 25 years, were first carried in the Soviet newspapers *Izvestiya* and *Pravda*. In fact, the Soviets have carried on a brutal media campaign against the Polish Pope since he took office five years ago.

In what appears to be a direct quote from the Soviet press, Lee makes the following disparaging remarks regarding Pope John Paul II's support for the Polish trade union, Solidarity:

"It is rather ironic that John Paul II should chastise priests for engaging in political activity when he is by far the most overtly political pope of modern times. John Paul has even threatened to fight alongside his countrymen should the Soviets try to crush the worker's rebellion in Poland. And his political activism has not only included well-publicized trips and rhetorical speeches. With his approval, the Vatican quietly funneled \$40 million to Solidarity. But de-

spite the pontiffs support for the Polish union—and the issuing of an encyclical in strong defense of the rights of labor—his sympathies do not extend to the rights of workers in Vatican City: he has opposed demands for decent wages by the Vatican's low-paid employees, and there have even been rumblings of a possible strike."

The above-cited, so-called facts by Lee attacking Pope John Paul II are right out of the KGB's disinformation manual for its media campaign against the Polish Pope.

The most effective outlet for the IPS is the Pacific News Service (PNS), an "alternate news agency" that began as a project of the Bay Area Institute, an organization established with money from the IPS in 1970. IPS cofounder Richard J. Barnet serves as a "contributing editor" of the PNS. According to *Human Events*, PNS supplies about 30 stories a month to more than 200 subscribers. These have included newspapers such as *In These Times*, the *Guardian*, as well as major newspapers such as the *Cleveland Plain Dealer*, the *Atlanta Journal*, the *Boston Globe*, the *Chicago Tribune*, the *Los Angeles Times*, and the *San Francisco Examiner*.

Perhaps the most important outlet for the PNS, which is marketed nationally by the *Des Moines Register* and *Tribune Syndicate*, is the *Washington Post*. According to Sandy Close, an editor at PNS, Post Executive Editor Ben Bradlee made the decision several years ago to purchase a subscription to PNS stories.

Another interesting fact cited in the *Human Events* article on the IPS is that Karen DeYoung, Foreign Editor for the *Washington Post*, is a paid instructor at the IPS "Washington School" for journalists . . . what a cozy relationship the IPS enjoys with one of the most powerful papers in the country.

In January 1982, M.A. Suslov, the most powerful member of the Secretariat of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union (CPSU), died as the result of a heart attack. Suslov was quietly replaced on the Secretariat by no less than Yuri Vladimirovich Andropov, who had been the Director of the KGB since 1967. Immediately after taking control of the KGB in 1967, Andropov elevated the Disinformation Department to the status of an independent Directorate, known as Directorate "A," one of only five principal Directorates in the KGB. In order to follow this rather complicated study on Soviet disinformation, it is important to remember that Andropov is a hard-line, tough, and xenophobic Russian communist leader who headed the KGB for 15 years, which is by far longer than any other Soviet "Spy Boss" was able to stay in office.

Within a week after Andropov was appointed to the secretariat of the CPSU, the KGB's worldwide disinformation apparatus commenced a campaign to enhance his image and to make him appear to be the "second coming of Christ" in the eyes of the Western media. The U.S. and European media, print and TV, took the KGB's phony background on Andropov—hook, line and sinker. Leonard Brezhnev, the leader of the Soviet Union for 18 years, died in early November 1982, and the U.S. media speculated that it would be months before the CPSU could reach an agreement on Brezhnev's successor. However, as usual, the media's crystal-ball gazing on Soviet political intrigue was dead wrong. Just five days after Brezhnev expired, Andropov was appointed by the CPSU to take over the helm of the Soviet Union.



The KGB's clever disinformation campaign to make Andropov look like a liberal intellectual with "Jet Set" tendencies paid off beyond their wildest dreams. Every major newspaper, magazine, and TV network swallowed and then regurgitated the KGB's phony image of its longtime boss Andropov. Ironically, only one major U.S. publication had the moral courage and fortitude to blow the whistle on the ridiculous portrayal of Andropov as an urbane and benevolent leader who would be a pussycat in dealing with the U.S. on such serious matters as arms control and Soviet support to guerrillas in El Salvador. The 7 February 1983 edition of *The New Republic* magazine carried a cover story entitled "The Andropov Hoax—The Americanization of Yuri." The author of this fine piece of investigative journalism is Edward J. Epstein, who is currently completing a book on international deception. The mere fact that *The New Republic* had the "guts" to publish Epstein's expose of the Andropov myth that was being foisted off on the American people by all segments of our media restores my faith in the old adage, "The truth will out." In his article on the Andropov hoax, Epstein provides examples in the following newspapers and magazines: *The Washington Post*, *The New York Times*, *The Wall Street Journal*, *The Christian Science Monitor*, and the *U.S. News & World Report*. I have included several paragraphs from Epstein's article to graphically demonstrate just how gullible and uninformed our media is when it comes to reporting on a broad gamut of topics concerning the Soviet Union.

"Andropov's accession to power last November was accompanied by a corresponding ennoblement of his image. Suddenly he became, in *The Wall Street Journal*, silver-haired and dapper." His stature, previously reported in *The Washington Post* as an unimpressive 'five feet, eight inches,' was abruptly elevated to 'tall and urbane.' The *New York Times* noted that Andropov 'stood conspicuously taller than most' Soviet leaders and that 'his spectacles, intense gaze and donnish demeanor gave him the air of a scholar.' *U.S. News & World Report*, on the other hand, reported that 'he has notoriously bad eyesight and wears thick spectacles.'

Andropov's linguistic abilities also came in for scrutiny. Harrison Salisbury of the *New York Times* wrote, "The first thing to know about Mr. Andropov is that he speaks and reads English." *Newsweek* reported that even though he had never met a "senior" American official, "he spoke English and relaxed with American novels." The *Washington Post* passed along a rumor that Andropov was partly Jewish. (Andropov was rapidly becoming That Cosmopolitan Man.)

Soon there were reports that Andropov was a man of extraordinary accomplishments, with some interests and proclivities that are unusual in a former head of the KGB. According to an article in the *Washington Post*, Andropov "is fond of cynical political jokes with an antiregime twist. . . collects abstract art, likes jazz and Gypsy music," and "has a record of stepping out of his high party official's cocoon to contact dissidents." Also, he swims, "plays tennis," and wears clothes that are "sharply tailored in West European style." *The Wall Street Journal* added that Andropov "likes Glenn Miller records, good scotch whisky, Oriental rugs, and American books." To the list of his musical favorites, *Time* added "Chubby Checker, Frank Sinatra, Peggy Lee, and Bob Eberly," and, asserting that he had once

worked as a Volga boatman, said that he enjoyed singing hearty renditions of Russian songs.

The press narrowed down Andropov's birthplace to an area stretching from Finland to Iran. There was also some vagueness with respect to his education. The *Wall Street Journal* reported that he had "graduated" from an unnamed "technical college," but *U.S. News & World Report* had him "drop out" of Petrozavodsk University, while *Newsweek* awarded him a diploma from the Rybinsk Water Transportation Technicum, a vocational school that teaches river navigation.

Columnist Joseph Kraft, who was in Moscow in January 1983, was told by Giorgi Arbatov, the Soviet Union's most prestigious "Americanologist" and an associate of Andropov, that Andropov, to his knowledge, "does not speak English."

What emerges from Epstein's article on the attempts of the U.S. press to piece together a version of Andropov's background would make a good script worthy of playing on "Saturday Night Live": the head of the KGB as one wild and crazy guy. Epstein makes the point at the conclusion of his story on the Andropov hoax, that the excesses that led to the invention of a media Andropov proceed directly from a common conceit of journalism that witnesses and "color" can be found for any great event. For the press, the humbler—and more honest—alternative is to admit that virtually nothing is known about this man Andropov: not the names of his parents, not his ethnic background, not his linguistic abilities, not even his ideas. He stands at the helm of the Soviet Union, but we don't even know how tall he really is.

Representative Lawrence P. McDonald was killed in the crash of the KAL 747, shot down by a Soviet SU-15 fighter in early September. Rep. McDonald, a five-term Georgia Democrat, was known as the most fervent anticommunist in the Congress. In the late 1970s, Rep. McDonald and a small group of other concerned congressmen, businessmen, and retired military officers established a conservative foundation known as Western Goals. The foundation is dedicated to "rebuild and strengthen the political, economic, and social structure of the United States and Western Civilization so as to make any merger with totalitarians impossible."

Western Goals publishes a monthly newsletter and, in addition, prepares special reports and studies on international, political, diplomatic, economic, and military matters. One of the most informative and interesting reports they have published in book format is entitled *Broken Seals*. This report provides an in-depth account of foreign and domestic attempts to destroy, through disinformation activities, the intelligence and counterintelligence capabilities of the CIA and the FBI. *Broken Seals* pulls no punches, and details the names of individuals and organizations in this country believed to be involved in disinformation operations targeted against the CIA and the FBI.

Representative Newt Gingrich, a fellow Georgia conservative, declared on national TV that "Perhaps the death of Rep. McDonald will educate more people about the Soviet Union's real threat to world peace than he could in his life." As time goes by, the Soviets may wish that McDonald were still alive, rather than being remembered in the U.S. as an anticommunist martyr who was murdered by them.

The 12 June 1982 edition of *TV Guide* carried a cover story entitled "Why American

TV Is So Vulnerable to Foreign Disinformation." *TV Guide* had every reason to bring to the attention of the public that the television networks, including the Public Broadcasting System (PBS), had been influenced by KGB disinformation intrigues for many years. For instance, in May 1980, the taxpayer-funded PBS aired a three-hour documentary entitled "On Company Business." The documentary was narrated by Phillip Agee, the CIA defector, and was a KGB masterpiece of lies, distortions, and innuendo about U.S. foreign policy and the U.S. intelligence community. In its six-page expose of disinformation programs that ABC, CBS, and NBC have aired over the past several years, *TV Guide* was brutally frank, and to say the least, the TV networks were shocked and displeased over the article. The article extensively quoted Arkady Shevchenko, the highest-ranking Soviet diplomat ever to defect to the U.S. Shevchenko claims that American TV networks and viewers are the prime targets of the KGB's disinformation program. "To get on American TV is one of the highest priorities on the agenda of the KGB's Directorate 'A.'"

The numerous examples of KGB disinformation I have cited in this article are, of course, those that have been exposed over the past two or three years. I can assure the readers that there are hundreds of KGB disinformation operations, known to the FBI and the CIA, going on in this country and that there are probably just as many disinformation cases that have yet to be ferreted out by our intelligence services.

This article on the Soviet Union's massive disinformation effort in the U.S. and Europe is not intended to impugn the honesty or integrity of our journalists or the media. However, I believe that only through public disclosure of the Soviet Union's attempt to manipulate U.S. public opinion through the KGB's disinformation program can the public acquire the knowledge needed to discern what is factual reporting of the news and what constitutes disinformation. In the event a reader believes he has been subjected to disinformation in the press or on TV, I suggest he or she write a letter to the editor of the newspaper or manager of the TV station and cite your reason for questioning what you've read or heard. Writing letters to newspapers or TV stations is one of the most powerful tools we citizens have for thwarting KGB disinformation planted in our media.

#### BIOGRAPHY OF JACK F. MATHEWS

Lecturer and consultant on United States and Soviet Intelligence operations as they relate to national security and foreign policy.

Service as Senior Intelligence Officer with Central Intelligence Agency, Foreign Intelligence Directorate for period of twenty-five years. Last assignment as Acting Chief of Operations for Latin America. Service performed in Asia, Africa, Europe and Latin America. Conversational in French, Spanish and Mandarin Chinese. Awarded Distinguished Service Commendation for 1972-1973 Vietnam service with agency.

Service with U.S. Army, Korea.

Graduate of University of Montana with major in Anthropology.

**IN THE MATTER OF THE FAILURE OF FAIRVIEW ORCHARDS ASSOCIATES TO HIRE THE SCRIVENS CREW**

**HON. HOWARD L. BERMAN**

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 17, 1985

Mr. BERMAN. Mr. Speaker, during the course of hearings before the Subcommittee on Immigration, Refugees, and International Law on H.R. 3080, the subcommittee heard testimony from grower representatives and from the administration to the effect that there are not enough domestic farmworkers to harvest perishable crops in this country, and that as a part of immigration reform designed to protect domestic jobs, hundreds of thousands of temporary agricultural guestworkers must be admitted to the United States.

This assertion regarding the unavailability of domestic farmworkers is the basis of proposals that we dramatically expand the size of the current H-2 Program and weaken its protections for domestic workers, institute a transition program to warn growers from their dependence on undocumented workers, and that we, in effect, restore to public law the shameful bracero program.

Today and in the coming weeks, I want to call to the attention of my colleagues a series of opinions issued by the Department of Labor that disproves the assertions of growers that domestic farmworkers are unavailable. What these opinions document is that growers have engaged in a consistent pattern of discriminating against domestic farmworkers, refusing to hire them, and kicking them out of such jobs as they are able to secure, only to turn around and claim that domestic farmworkers are unavailable.

I begin today with the opinion captioned "In the Matter of the Failure of Fairview Orchards Associates to Hire the Scrivens Crew," in which the Regional Administrator of the Department of Labor found that the grower simply refused to hire 31 U.S. farmworkers, in violation of the regulations governing the H-2 Program.

I invite my colleagues to read this and other DOL opinions. What we find is not the unavailability of U.S. farmworkers, but rather the growers' preference for foreign farmworkers, and I do not think we should sanction that preference in the name of immigration reform.

The article follows:

**IN THE MATTER OF THE FAILURE OF FAIRVIEW ORCHARDS ASSOCIATES TO HIRE THE SCRIVENS CREW**

(By William J. Haltigan)

This is a case involving an allegation by a United States crew leader (William Scrivens) that he and his crew were referred to jobs with a Maryland employer (Fairview Orchards Associates) by the Maryland State Employment Service in 1983, but were denied employment by the employer in violation of the assurances made by the employer pursuant to 20 CFR 655.203(e).

A worker with this type of complaint is required to exhaust his remedies at the State level before bringing the matter to the Federal level. However, the time limits for the complainant to file a complaint under the Job Service Complaint System had long since passed when I was informed of this case. Thus, Scrivens could not use the Job Service Complaint System.

The regulations governing the labor certification process for temporary agricultural and logging employment (20 CFR 655.210) state, "If . . . the RA has probable cause to believe that an employer has not lived up to the terms of the temporary labor certification, the RA shall investigate the matter." The regulation has no requirement as to the recency of the event. The information provided by Scrivens gives me probable cause to believe that Fairview Orchards Associates did not live up to the terms of its temporary labor certification issued in 1983. Therefore, I am required to investigate this matter.

This is my decision made as the result of that investigation.

**BACKGROUND**

This matter was called to my attention in a letter dated April 25, 1985, from Gregory Schell, Attorney for Scrivens. Schell asked that I " . . . conduct an investigation and take appropriate action. . . ."

The letter alleged that Scrivens and his crew contracted the Easton, Maryland office of the Maryland Employment Security Administration seeking farm employment on or about August 17, 1983. The Easton office told Scrivens of the Fairview Orchards Associates Job Order. Scrivens called Fairview Orchards Associates that day speaking with Jeffrey Reed. Scrivens indicated his willingness to accept the job. Scrivens was told that Fairview Orchards Associates could not immediately hire a crew since its camps were full. Scrivens did not go to Fairview Orchards since he was informed that no family housing was available for him or his crew. Scrivens then transported his crew back to Immokalee, Florida, where the crew did not have regular work until late October 1983.

Fairview Orchards Associates received certification for the temporary employment of alien farm workers in 1983. As a condition for obtaining this certification, Fairview Orchards Associates was required to make, and did make, the following assurance:

"From the time the foreign workers depart for the employer's place of employment, the employer will provide employment to any qualified U.S. worker who applies to the employer until fifty percent of the period of the work contract, under which the foreign worker who is in the job was hired, has elapsed." 20 CFR 655.203(e)

The job offer made by Fairview Orchards Associates was required to contain, and did contain, this benefit:

"The employer will provide the worker with housing without charge to the worker." 20 CFR 655.202(b)(1)

At the time this alleged incident occurred, Fairview Orchards Associates was employing foreign workers. The job order submitted as a condition to obtain these foreign workers (Agricultural and Food Processing Clearance Order No. 4072459) showed an anticipated period of employment from July 12, 1983 to November 4, 1983. The 20 CFR 655.203(e) "50 percent rule" would require U.S. workers to be hired if they applied for work prior to September 7, 1983. Thus, if Fairview Orchards Associates refused to hire workers and provide them with housing prior to September 7, 1983, they would not

have lived up to the terms of the temporary labor certification.

**DISCUSSION**

Staff from the Philadelphia Regional Office of the Employment and Training Administration were assigned to investigate this matter. They visited Hagerstown, Maryland June 18 and 19, 1985, to conduct this investigation. Many of the principals involved were no longer available for questioning. These include Robert Storer, Employment Counselor at the Hagerstown local office and Drew Hess, Rural Services Representative at the Hagerstown local office, both of whom contacted Fairview Orchards Associates on behalf of Scrivens, and Jeffrey Reed, Comptroller at Fairview Orchards, who represented Fairview Orchards in the dealings with Scrivens. Scrivens and Schell were interviewed as where John Porterfield, the present Orchards' Manager for Fairview Orchards Associates, and Merlin Williams, the present Rural Services Representative in the Hagerstown local office. Telephone notes made by Hess and Reed in 1983 were made available to the investigators and were reviewed. In addition, an August 4, 1983, memorandum from the Hagerstown local office manager to Stuart O. Douglass, Maryland Employment Service Director, was reviewed.

This material provided contemporary information about the 1983 incident so that valid conclusions can be made about what transpired, despite the long lapse of time between the incident and the investigation.

The investigation revealed the following facts:

(1) On August 4, 1983, Reed informed Storer that Fairview Orchards Associates was hiring on " . . . as needed basis. When a vacancy exists in the camp they will consider hiring a non-local domestic." Storer pressed the issue, reminding Reed of the 50 percent rule. He called Reed's attention to the fact that foreign H-2 workers were employed, but Reed refused to change his position on the hiring policy. Later that day Storer called Reed to refer a crew and was told Reed would " . . . follow through with the formality of speaking with the crew leader but will inform the crew leader that Fairview has no openings for crews at this time." (Information and quote from August 4, 1983, Pruett to Douglass memorandum.)

(2) Scrivens and his crew were experienced farm workers and were interested in and available for employment with Fairview Orchards Associates. Crew consisted of 31 individuals, including 5 married couples.

(3) Staff of the Hagerstown local office and Scrivens spoke with Reed about employment with Fairview Orchards Associates. Scrivens was not offered employment.

(4) Reed's notes indicate that Scrivens was familiar with the job order; that he had Federal and State Crew Leader Registration numbers; that his crew consisted of 31 individuals, including five women; and that in the absence of family housing, the crew leader "will make arrangements."

(5) While Reed's notes are related in item (4), it was apparent from all available evidence that there was ample housing available to accommodate Scrivens and his crew.

**DECISION**

I find that Fairview Orchards Associates is in violation of 20 CFR 655.203(e) since employment was not provided to qualified U.S. workers who had applied to Fairview



Orchards Associates within the time period covered by the 50 percent rule.

Having found this violation, I must now decide whether to invoke the only penalty available under the regulations: Notification of the employer that it will not be eligible to apply for a temporary labor certification in the coming year.

In considering whether to apply the ineligibility sanction, I will follow the principles in the MESA CITRUS GROWERS decision by Administrative Law Judge Alfred Lindeman, September 5, 1980 (Cases Nos. 80-TLC-10 through 80-TLC-13). These principles involve imposing the sanction only where there has been a demonstrated adverse effect on U.S. workers, bad faith on the part of the employer, or a pattern of violations.

It is my opinion that the principles of MESA CITRUS are met in this case.

There was a demonstrated adverse effect on U.S. workers in that Scrivens and his crew of 31 workers were not offered employment.

There was bad faith on the part of the employer involved. The record shows that Reed had no intention of hiring migrant workers, if they needed housing. His statement that he would "... follow through with the formality of speaking with the crew leader but will inform the crew leader that Fairview has no openings for crews at this time ..." (quoted by Pruett in his August 4, 1983, memorandum in relation to another crew seeking employment) is an especially blatant disregard for his obligation to hire U.S. workers as Fairview Orchards Associates obligated itself to do when it provided the assurances required by the labor certification regulations. This violation is particularly egregious since Reed was advised and warned by Storer that his policy was not proper.

This is not the only violation of the labor certification regulations by Fairview Orchards Associates. I have previously (August 2, 1985) found Fairview Orchards Associates to be in violation of 20 CFR 655.202(a), 20 CFR 655.203(e), and 20 CFR 655.207(c). I conclude that the violation found in this instance is part of a continuing pattern of violations of the labor certification regulations by Fairview Orchards Associates.

Therefore, it is my decision that Fairview Orchards Associates is not eligible to apply for a temporary labor certification in the coming year.

Fairview Orchards Associates may request a hearing on this matter before a United States Department of Labor Administration Law Judge. The request for a hearing must be made within 30 days of the date of this decision. The request for a hearing must be addressed to William J. Haltigan, Regional Administrator, Employment and Training Administration, United States Department of Labor, P.O. Box 8796, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, 19101.

#### A REPORT ON THE 1985 WORLD FOOD CRISIS

**HON. MICKEY LELAND**

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 17, 1985

Mr. LELAND. Mr. Speaker, I commend to you a report on the 1985 World Food Crisis prepared by the Interfaith Hunger Appeal, an activity of Church World Service,

Catholic Relief Service and the American Jewish Joint Distribution Committees.

#### WORLD FOOD SECURITY: A PERSONAL RESPONSIBILITY

A REPORT ON THE 1985 WORLD FOOD CRISIS

(Prepared by Interfaith Hunger Appeal)

An activity of Church World Service, Catholic Relief Service, the American Jewish Joint Distribution Committee

Hunger and malnutrition in the midst of plentiful harvests worldwide constitute the major scandal of our time. Enough food is produced in the world every year to feed every person on the planet, and yet half a billion people, twice the population of the United States, face starvation every day because they do not have access to adequate food. Starving people have neither the land, water, seeds nor tools to grow food nor the income to buy it from others who have grown it.

Not all hungry people die from lack of food, but many of the most vulnerable among them, children, nursing or pregnant women, the elderly, the refugees, the landless, do die of hunger and its accompanying illnesses and disabilities. All of these people at risk are created in the image of God; all of them have the unalienable right to life. Death from hunger violates that right. And it is unnecessary.

Those who know the hunger story and who are in a position to affect private and public policy have a responsibility to do so. In last year's report IHA stated that hunger is a problem to the family—the human family, all of us. This year we carry this point one step further; hunger is the personal responsibility of each of us.

Hunger in the world challenges the strength and solidarity of the human family; more than that, it tests the depth and sincerity of each person's religious and moral commitment. We who have so much are obliged to help those who have so little and whose need is so great. This is an obligation in justice as well as in charity, and we must come to terms with it. Hunger is man-made; human effort can and must resolve it.

#### THE CHALLENGE

In 1974 the United Nations convened the first World Food Conference in Rome. Based on the analysis presented, the Conference adopted a score of recommendations for remedial action and pledged, in an emotional statement, to eliminate hunger within ten years. Failure to achieve that goal was acknowledged at last year's Tenth Anniversary session held, appropriately, in Addis Ababa.

The international community has fallen short on two of the three objectives that underpinned the WFC recommendations: 1. There is no international grain reserve. 2. Small-farm agriculture has not improved in most food-deficit countries. 3. Despite increasing world food surpluses, the food aid target of ten million tons annually was not reached until 1984, the year of the deadly African famine.

However, the situation is not hopeless. The world's food production has increased substantially over the decade. Today, the world is now feeding about a billion more people than eleven years ago. In a quantitative sense, ground has not been lost. In response to prodding by the World Food Council, Developing World governments are committing more resources to producing their own food and to improving nutrition and primary health care. Aid through multi-

lateral channels has increased, and many poor countries have improved their food security position by reducing imports and becoming more self-reliant in food.

Yet the numbers of malnourished people have not declined; the accompanying map shows where most of these people are located. Vulnerable groups are not being reached effectively in many instances. UNICEF estimates that in 1985 as many as 15 million children will die unnecessarily in these food-deficit countries unless immediate remedial and preventive action is taken.

The World Food Council's 1985 meeting confirmed and underscored the tragic paradox that had been apparent a year earlier in Ethiopia. On the one hand, hunger now is better understood; it is acknowledged that its roots lie deep in history, that it is more a problem of underdevelopment and lack of access than lack of production. Almost everyone now agrees that hunger can best be addressed by a strategy in which food-deficit country governments act in concert with the international community in a coordinated effort to eliminate this scourge. The other side of the paradox, ironically, is that at the precise moment when the above consensus is emerging and the commitment of Developing World governments is increasing, the resources available from the international community are decreasing. Although the global recession has not slowed global military expenditures, it has clearly combined with the clash of ideologies to dampen concerted remedial action against hunger.

#### ETHIOPIA, A WINDOW TO A HUNGRY WORLD

To be understood clearly and addressed effectively, hunger has to be seen in concrete, specific, vivid terms; it is hungry people. No one needs any longer to be reminded that there are famine and drought in Africa, most particularly in Ethiopia. However, it was not the consistent emphasis of UN bodies and the pleading reports from private agencies that captured the attention of policymakers in the international community. It was the graphic television news coverage of starving people that penetrated American and European homes beginning in October, 1984. The tragic pictures of emaciated mothers and starving children evoked an unprecedented outpouring of public giving to private relief agencies and a demand for governmental action.

The situation on Ethiopia and in several other African countries continues to be critical. This crisis reflects not so much the limitations of the relief efforts, as the failure of the affected governments and the international community to grasp the magnitude of the disaster. What private relief agencies had been reporting as far back as the Sahel famine of 1973 suddenly became a worldwide, televised tragedy.

The dramatic events in Ethiopia, which have seized the attention and moved the hearts of many people throughout the world, are, however, no more than the most current manifestation of trends and tendencies that will not be corrected merely by massive shipments of food. Food is essential to starving people, but at the same time the international community has an opportunity to go beyond the moment and to study and treat the causes of hunger, poverty and underdevelopment. What is needed in addition to food is preventive developmental assistance. Otherwise, the African tragedy of 1984-85 will be repeated time and time again.

Even allowing for adverse climatic conditions, inadequate and unpredictable rainfall, the major lesson of Ethiopia is that hunger is the result of human decisions and actions. Soil depletion, overgrazing, deforestation, population pressures, etc., all resulting from human decisions, have taken their toll. Civil war and the influx of refugees from other countries have complicated the problem in Ethiopia as well as in other nations of the world. International economic factors beyond the control of developing nations undercut their ability to meet the basic needs of their people. Inappropriate internal policies, especially economic discrimination against rural populations and the agricultural sector, have reduced farmer incentives and have left many of these countries more dependent on food imports which they can neither afford to buy nor borrow to purchase.

Food aid at this time is absolutely essential. One of its chief values is that it buys time—time for human behavior to develop and for public policy to change.

#### WORLD HUNGER, A REGIONAL LOOK

Africa is the region in which famine is most dramatic, the need most urgent. But the quieter crisis, the chronic undernutrition of millions of people, is in Asia. There are probably more hungry, malnourished people in India alone than in all of Africa; indeed the population of India is almost twice that of Africa. And yet India will export grain this year.

Widespread hunger exists despite the fact that the Asian continent has been consistently increasing its food production during the last ten years while dependence on food imports and, in particular, food aid has decreased dramatically. But the increase in production and the decrease in imports do not mean that nutritional need has been eliminated. As in other areas where hungry people struggle daily for survival, one of the greatest problems is access; hunger is concentrated in the poorest countries and mainly in the rural areas. Poor people are always the first potential victims of famines and droughts. Not only their hunger, but their poverty, must be treated. Providing food aid does not help much to correct poverty. An effective response requires increased developmental assistance, more equitable international trade policies, more humane debt policies and more need-oriented investment, domestic and foreign.

In Latin America, by contrast, the growth of great urban concentrations has given hunger in the region a more urban look and has changed both the nature of the problem and the structures through which it can be alleviated. The commercialization and export policies of much of Latin American agriculture has added to the problem by reducing the earning capacity of rural people at the same time that it pushes them toward increasing consumption of less nutritious imported "convenience" foods. Also, in Latin America, continuing civil strife is an additional factor disrupting agriculture and increasing the numbers of hungry people.

#### HUNGER IN AMERICA

There is hunger in the land of plenty. Poverty and economic dislocation plague the people of the United States in new and ever more visible ways: 35 million people are below the official poverty line; ten million people get food stamps, and many more need them; family farmers are being driven off the land, as rural communities decay; food lines, soup kitchens and shelters for the homeless are found in towns and cities

of all sizes. More and more the American worker, the "new poor," has become a victim of his nation's economy. And the "old poor" are increasing in number: senior citizens, minority youth, Native Americans, migrant farm workers and women who head households. How can this "made in America" hunger occur in prosperous and highly developed society? Some American people are hungry because they are, relatively speaking, poor, and they are poor because they have no social, economic or political position—unwittingly the system has marginalized them. Public policy and private practice must become more sensitive and responsive to the poor who hunger. Although the agencies of IHA do not work in America, hunger in America is of great concern.

#### THE LONG AND THE SHORT OF IT

Chronic malnutrition now affects some 500 million people in the world. Its pervasiveness and persistence pose a formidable challenge to the human family as a whole, and to each of us as responsible members of it. It is a challenge that demands immediate personal action, and long-term commitment. World hunger, global food insecurity, the inability of half-a-billion people to grow or buy the food they need, are issues that must be addressed in two time frames simultaneously.

In the short run starving people have a legitimate right to be fed; this is a requirement of fundamental justice. The major means of feeding is food aid—the kinds of food distribution programs that IHA agencies have been engaged in for at least half a century. The bulk of the food commodities distributed come from government sources. In the United States that source is mainly the Food for Peace program (Public Law 480). Well over \$30 billion worth of U.S. food has been made available in the three decades of that program, and millions of people are alive today who would not have survived without it.

At the same time, on a parallel track, it is essential to engage in the much more difficult task of helping these poor and hungry people improve the quality of their lives at least to the point where they are no longer dependent on an international food dole. People are hungry because they are poor; they are poor because they are poor; they are poor because they lack the power to choose otherwise. They are, in a sense, victims of an international economic system that unintentionally impoverishes them and keeps them poor. Those of us who benefit from that system, and above all those of us who make that system work, share a responsibility for making it work not only for our own benefit, but for the benefit of these disadvantaged people.

Food aid is necessary, but it is not enough; indeed, if providing food aid distracts us and the beneficiaries from attending to this longer-range action, it can, after the immediate needs are met, become a deterrent to the development that is needed to prevent future famines. Beyond charity, we have to institute justice. Moreover, we have to look not only at food aid and development assistance, but at all of our international economic transactions, such as private investment, commercial lending, trade in manufacturers and services and the sale of arms to poor nations. By improving and sensitizing the international economic system in which these transactions take place, society will naturally accord higher priority to meeting the basic human needs of the majority of the people of the world who are poor.

"Formidable" is the correct word for this task. Nonetheless, it is not beyond the power of human intelligence to devise a system that will ensure justice in economic actions, and not beyond the ability of the human will to make the sacrifices necessary to bring such a system into being.

Here we enter into the arena of public policy—not only of our own government, but of the governments of hungry people, whose policies, most analysts agree, are central to the alleviation of hunger. If a government sets food prices at a level that does not provide the local farmer with a reasonable return on his investment, food is unlikely to be produced in sufficient quantity to satisfy urban consumer needs. On the other hand, prices that are too high can fuel urban unrest. Assisting nations and private organizations with capital, technical assistance, training and a development-oriented approach to economic aid can help a government make and sustain the policy decisions required to move toward a more just distribution of the benefits of economic growth. It would seem that when you improve an individual's economic position, you enhance his opportunity for attaining food security.

#### INTERFAITH HUNGER APPEAL

Three experienced American private religious agencies have joined together in a major educational effort to address the challenge of world hunger. Working together since 1978 in a common appeal, our operations and outreach respond to hunger wherever it is found. Our programs try to deal with starvation, relief, refugee movement, reconstruction and development in Africa, Asia, Latin America, Eastern Europe and the Middle East. IHA agencies have counterparts which carry out comparable programs in the United States.

The members of IHA—Church World Service, Catholic Relief Services, and the American Jewish Joint Distribution Committee—work cooperatively with governments, international organizations, and other private agencies in a common effort, often using resources provided by the United States, other governments and the United Nations. A substantial portion of our budgets, however, is provided by individuals, acting on their own and contributing funds and resources through their religious organizations.

IHA agencies also seek to bring an awareness of world hunger to the American people through educational and promotional campaigns that invite their constituents to think and act for the improvement of the human condition. Our appeal to you, therefore, is on more than one level. As always, we need your money to purchase medicines, food, seeds, tools, and shelter and to pay for the delivery and distribution of these items. But even more, we need your concern, your ideas, your energies. We need your help to inform and educate the American people concerning the causes of hunger. Finally, we need your pledge to promote private and governmental policies that will convert the present international food system into a system that provides food and security for everyone on earth.

There is no doubt that hunger is the problem of our time, and equally there is no doubt that it has a solution. If we can walk on the moon, why can we not bring a starving man a piece of bread?—You are the Hope of the Hungry.



## TRANSPORTATION TRUST FUNDS BELONG OFF-BUDGET

HON. GLENN M. ANDERSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 17, 1985

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Speaker, the House will soon be considering H.R. 3500, the Omnibus Budget and Reconciliation Act of 1985. Included in this bill is a provision which would take the highway trust fund, including its mass transit account, and the aviation trust fund off-budget.

The revenues in these trust funds are generated by special taxes on transportation users, and may be utilized only for their designated transportation purposes. If a nickel less is authorized for any of these programs, it would not reduce the terrible deficit plaguing our Nation's economy by a nickel, and nor would it allow any increases in defense or other domestic programs, without similarly increasing the deficit.

These transportation trust funds clearly belong off-budget. Yet, amendments may be offered to the reconciliation bill that would retain them under the unified budget, so that the Federal Government can continue to deceive the American people into thinking that the deficit is smaller than it actually is.

The Office of Management and Budget would support those amendments to retain the trust fund programs under the unified budget. I am submitting for the RECORD a copy of a letter from OMB, a misguided letter, stating their views. I am also submitting a point-by-point rebuttal to that letter.

Mr. Speaker, our colleagues may be asked to consider this very important issue next week. By presenting both sides of the issue now, I believe they will have before them the information necessary to vote wisely, and vote against amendments that deceive the Nation's taxpayers, and deprive the Nation of the sound transportation network that our transportation users are paying for.

OFFICE OF MANAGEMENT AND BUDGET,  
Washington, DC, October 15, 1985.  
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: I would like to take this opportunity to express the Administration's opposition to the proposals included in H.R. 3500, the House Reconciliation Bill, to move the highway and airport and airways trust funds off-budget. I would also like to address what we believe is misinformation about the impact of the on-budget status of these trust funds.

It is unfortunate that the off-budget issue has been brought into the reconciliation process, as it may impede the timely enactment of reconciliation legislation, which most Committees in both Houses have addressed in good faith. If this issue is to be addressed, a more appropriate forum would be the highway reauthorization legislation.

The Administration opposes moving these transportation trust funds off-budget. On-budget status is important to provide a complete statement of total Government spending and to not misrepresent the size of the deficit. On-budget status provides the appropriate fiscal controls and oversight to

ensure prudent program management. Once off-budget, programs are exempt from statutory budget controls.

The Administration disagrees with the following arguments made by the House Public Works Committee in defense of off-budget status:

*Unified Budget Controls Unnecessary.* The Committee claims that on-budget appropriation controls are unnecessary because other controls exist through the authorization process and the Byrd amendment.

However, we note that the Committee's provision includes language that would exempt the trust funds from any "general budget limitation imposed by statute or expenditures." This is tantamount to saying that the budget process, as prescribed by the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 and other laws, is unnecessary. Such language could be interpreted as negating the Byrd amendment. Furthermore, neither the Byrd amendment nor the authorization process controls obligation levels which, in turn, are key to determining outlay levels. Controlling outlays is essential to preventing a deficit situation in the trust funds. Moreover, the Byrd amendment is not a firm control. Congress has revised it in the past to meet particular circumstances and could do so again.

*Unsuitability for Unified Budget.* The Committee claims that dedicated trust funds supported by user fees have no place in the unified budget. When included in the unified budget, they are used to understate the size of general revenue deficits and to provide a balance of funds for borrowing for other Government programs.

The user fee argument is shallow. User fees *per se* do not justify off-budget status. In fact, if adopted Government-wide, many user fee-funded programs would move off-budget.

Second, the claim that trust funds understate the size of the deficit presumes that trust fund balances are counted as an offset to the annual deficit. In fact, the annual deficit is the difference between annual receipts and outlays and does not count trust fund balances. Therefore, the annual deficit situation (outlays exceeding receipts) which the Administration projects in both the highway and airport trust funds adds to the deficit. Off-budget status would thus artificially reduce the size of the deficit. This is a particular concern in the Highway Trust Fund given the average annual deficit of \$2 billion which the Administration projects through 1990.

Finally, the Committee wrongly characterizes borrowing from the trust funds as a rationale for restraining trust fund spending. Government borrowing is simply a mechanism to credit the trust funds with interest. This investment practice benefits the Highway Trust Fund by over \$1 billion in additional resources each year.

*Limitations Distort Programs.* The Committee claims that obligation limitations have distorted ongoing programs by preventing States from fully obligating their allotted funds.

However, the obligation limitation is only one factor influencing States' abilities to program Federal funds. In the highway area, delays in Congressional approval of the Interstate Cost Estimate in recent years played havoc with the highway program. In addition, the ability of States to match Federal funds and program a sufficient number of projects influences the program. As a result, each year many States turn back unused funds.

In summary, the Administration believes that preserving the on-budget status is essential to the fiscal well-being of the highway and airport trust funds. We do not believe that on-budget status jeopardizes the integrity of the highway and airport programs.

The Administration greatly appreciates your concern with this issue and urges opposition to the House Public Works provision when the reconciliation bill is discussed in the House Rules Committee and on the House Floor.

Sincerely yours,

JAMES C. MILLER III,  
Director.

## POINT-BY-POINT REBUTTAL TO OMB TRUST FUNDS LETTER

1. Assertion: Reconciliation is an inappropriate vehicle for consideration of this issue. Highway reauthorization legislation would be better.

Response: By way of precedent, the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1981 placed the strategic petroleum reserve program (not a trust fund program) off budget.

It is the budget process treatment of trust fund-financed transportation programs this year that lies at the heart of the problems which the Public Works and Transportation Committee seeks to remedy by moving the trust funds, off budget. If the budget process is causing a problem, where more suitable to deal with it than through the budget process itself?

If not here, then where? Certainly not through the appropriations process (in which the House recently moved to cut transit obligations by \$90 million below the budget resolution) and certainly not through authorization legislation which the Senate can ignore for months if not years on end.

Practically speaking, this is the only way to make sure that the Senate, whose reconciliation numbers for highways incidentally are significantly below the budget resolution directives, confronts the issue.

2. Assertion: On-budget status is important to provide a complete statement of total Government spending and to not misrepresent the size of the deficit.

Response: Inclusion of *deficit-proof* trust funds in the unified budget with deficit-ridden general revenues is misleading in that (1) it implies that the trust fund revenues can be used for purposes other than those to which the funds are dedicated by law and (2) it uses any surplus to understate the real deficit.

As to a complete statement of total Government spending, there is absolutely nothing in off-budget status which would prevent the Administration or the Congress from publishing comprehensive data concerning on- and off-budget programs. It is without merit to argue, however, that the need for publication of information can be transformed into a rationale for *common control* of fundamentally dissimilar funds.

3. Assertion: On-budget status provides the appropriate fiscal controls and oversight to ensure prudent program management. Once off-budget, programs are exempt from statutory budget controls.

Response: As can be elaborated further below, all of the controls necessary for these programs are in existence (or soon will be in the case of aviation): The authorization process, anti-deficit mechanisms, scrutiny by the Ways and Means Committee in the process of determining revenue levels, and obligation limitations under the jurisdiction

of the authorizing committee. These will remain in place in full force and effect when the programs move off-budget.

The only constraint that will not be there will be unjustified pressure to hold down trust fund program spending to permit higher spending for general-fund programs.

4. Assertion: The Public Works language is tantamount to saying that the budget process is unnecessary.

Response: The Public Works language recognizes that deficit-proof trust funds derived from user-paid revenues and dedicated to particular purposes must be controlled, but not by the same controls applicable to general revenue programs.

Presumably, the fiscal controls to which the OMB letter refers are obligation limitations imposed in appropriations acts (although section 401(d) of the Budget Act exempts these programs from such requirements). The Appropriations Committees can be expected to continue this practice; but the difference would be that such would occur in the absence of artificial pressure to constrain trust fund programs so as to accommodate increased general fund spending within overall budget totals.

The heart of the Public Works language is patterned after language in the Social Security amendments of 1983 which placed certain Social Security trust funds off budget effective in 1992. NOTE: Transportation trust funds are subject to greater controls than Social Security entitlement programs.

5. Assertion: The Public Works language could negate the Byrd Amendment. [This is the anti-deficiency provision contained in the highway revenue status; a similar provision applies to the mass transit account, and title VIII of H.R. 3500 would extend similar protection to the aviation trust fund.]

Response: This is absurd. The Public Works language simply refers to exemption of the trust funds from any "general budget limitation imposed by statute on expenditures . . ." By contrast, the Byrd amendment is not a general budget limitation. It is a requirement that apportionments of transportation funds cannot be made (or must be reduced) if the revenues anticipated to flow into the trust funds are expected to be insufficient to pay the bills when they come due.

6. Assertion: Neither the Byrd amendment nor the "authorization process" controls obligation levels, which are key to determining outlays.

Response: The Byrd amendment limits the availability of funds for obligation. As carried out by the Public Works Committee, the "authorization process" includes the imposition of obligation limitations in highway legislation.

7. Assertion: Controlling outlays is essential to preventing a deficit situation in trust funds.

Response: Those outlays are successfully controlled by the Byrd amendment through the periodic review of outstanding authorizations and revenues in connection with yearly apportionment of funds authorized for each fiscal year.

8. Assertion: The Byrd amendment is not a firm control because the Congress revised it.

Response: True, this was done once in the early, start-up years of the program to accommodate a temporary cash-flow problem. To portray this as common practice is misleading. Furthermore, revision of the Byrd amendment would require an enactment of law via legislation originating in the Committee on Ways and Means.

9. Assertion: User-fee status does not justify off-budget status.

Response: User-fee status does not justify off-budget status as a general proposition, nor does the Public Works and Transportation Committee so contend. The Committee does contend that revenues in a deficit-proof trust fund, derived from users of the transportation system, should not be (1) used to understate the size of the deficit (as argued above) or (2) to make possible increased spending for non-trust-fund programs.

The Public Works initiative did not originate in a vacuum. It is a practical response to distortions to which the trust funds have been subjected through the budget process.

10. Assertion: The Public Works position assumes that trust funds take in more in revenues than they spend out in outlays.

Response: Incorrect. The relation between income and outgo can vary between trust funds or with respect to a single trust at one time versus another. The Public Works position is that decisions made with respect to the programs financed by those funds—given overwhelming needs—should be made on the basis of the soundness of the funds rather than budgetary manipulation. These particular trust funds belong off budget regardless of whether the change would appear to enlarge or reduce the deficit in the unified budget.

11. Assertion: The Public Works Committee is incorrect in claiming that obligation limitations have distorted ongoing programs by preventing States from fully obligating their allotted funds.

Response: The OMB letter itself recognizes that a number of factors can influence the progress of a given state's highway program, including difficulty in coming up with non-Federal matching funds, delays in Congressional approval of the Interstate Cost Estimate, readiness of projects to proceed. But if obligation limitations each year are held to the level of new authorizations, those backlogs, once developed for whatever reason, will be perpetuated.

For example, the reconciliation package would set a ceiling of \$13.25 billion on the highway program for fiscal year 1986. With some \$750 million authorized for projects outside the ceiling, this would mean a \$14 billion program. If new budget authority for fiscal year 1986 is held to \$14.7 billion as we propose, we will be still adding some \$700 million to the total backlog of unobligated apportionments which stood at \$6.2 billion as of September 30, 1985.

## THE DIVERSIFIED FUTURE OF THE ELECTRIC INDUSTRY

HON. EDWARD J. MARKEY

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 17, 1985

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. Speaker, I am submitting today for inclusion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article by Richard Munson from last Sunday's Washington Post (Oct. 13, 1985) on the future of electric power generation. The article is a valuable contribution to the national dialog on the shape of electricity demand as we near the 21st century, and on the varied and novel ways in which that uncertain demand might be met. I commend Mr. Munson's

thoughtful analysis to my colleagues' attention.

[From the Washington Post, Oct. 13, 1985]

ELECTRIC POWER TO THE PEOPLE—WILL ENTREPRENEURIAL GENERATORS SEND MEGAWATT DINOSAURS THE WAY OF AT&T?

(By Richard Munson)

Bernard Bartos knew by 1980 that his company—Dow Corning—could not afford electricity from the nuclear reactor being built in Midland, Mich. Consumers Power, the state's largest utility, admitted that construction costs for the Midland plant had soared 15 times over the original 1967 budget and that electric rates would climb at least 68 percent between 1984 and 1990. Bartos believed he could generate less expensive power.

In January 1983, the Dow Corning executive proved his contention by inaugurating an 11-story, \$35 million facility that generates 22 megawatts of electricity and 275,000 pounds of steam per hour, enough to save the giant, 950-employee silicone factory 25 percent of its \$10-million-a-year energy bill.

It is fueled largely with wood wastes from sawmills, pulp mills and lumbering operations within a 75-mile radius of the central Michigan city. But its most extraordinary feature is the Dow Corning—rather than the electric utility monopoly—owns and operates the power plant. "We are the pioneers of an unregulated electricity business," declares Bartos.

Bartos is only one of about 2,000 entrepreneurs who have been spurred by rising utility rates (much of it caused by overbudget nuclear reactors) to invest and promote an array of electricity-supplying technologies. Only a few years ago, these independent power producers—who cogenerate steam and electricity, burn wastes and harness the sun, wind, falling water and geothermal steam—were dismissed as backyard tinkers with limited potential.

Yet today, according to reports from the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission and state public utility commissions, their assets total more than \$45 billion, and they will, by the end of this decade, supply a quarter or more of the electric power in several regions of the country.

Such a large-scale entry of independent electricity providers into a field dominated by regulated monopolies could present consumers and legislators with headaches as monumental as that associated with the breakup of AT&T, or the deregulation of the banking and airline industries. But it also could save ratepayers billions and be a boon to the environment by postponing indefinitely the need for behemoth nuclear or coal-fired generators.

In California, the Public Utilities Commission reports that independents increased their capacity over the past three years from only 100 megawatts to 2,000 megawatts, about the equivalent of two nuclear reactors.

Moreover, the commission reports, California entrepreneurs are constructing an additional 12,750 megawatts, enough to boost their output by decade's end to a third of the state's current electrical capacity.

About 43 percent of the independent power production comes from cogenerators—devices that burn anything from natural gas to coal to wood and, instead of producing only one useful product, as normal installations do, produce two—electricity plus steam for heating water or driving industrial machines. Thirty percent comes



from wind-energy developers, 12 percent from wood or other biomass burners, 8 percent from small hydro operators, and the remaining 7 percent is divided between geothermal and solar entrepreneurs, according to the California Public Utilities Commission.

The contrast is stark with Pacific Gas & Electric's controversial Diablo Canyon nuclear reactors, which are built near an earthquake fault and have been the target of the largest antinuclear protests in American history. Since 1983, electric entrepreneurs, installing power plants averaging only 12 megawatts—100 times smaller than a large reactor—created as much new capacity as Diablo Canyon, in less than one-fifth the time, without an eightfold increase in the planned budget and without protests.

Similar growth is occurring in Texas, Maine, Michigan, New York and other pockets across the country where utility rates are high, according to state public utility commissions. In Houston, for example, independents added 1,300 megawatts of electricity—more than a large nuclear reactor—within the past two years. Houston Lighting & Power executives say cogenerators are developing another 6,000 megawatts—more than half the utility's current capacity. Houston Lighting & Power vice president Eugene Simmons, who wants to transmit the excess power to other regions, complains, "We are being overwhelmed by cogeneration." In Maine, electric entrepreneurs will supply one third of the state's electricity by the decade's end.

Since each installation is negligibly small by the standards mammoth utilities are used to, and the movement is only significant when it dawns on statisticians that thousands of such units are coming on line at the same time, the new businesses have been virtually ignored by industry analysts. One exception is James Liles of the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, who says the growth of independent electricity producers has been "mind-boggling" and represents "a massive redeployment of generating capacity."

Jan Hamrin, director of Independent Energy Producers, a California trade association, claims that "utilities will never again build centralized power plants because entrepreneurs can generate electric power faster, safer and cheaper than can utility monopolies." Yet most utility executives either ignore or vehemently oppose the advance of competition in the electricity market. Idaho Power chairman James Bruce claims that independent producers cannot reliably supply electricity, and he argues that "it's dumb to tinker with the structure of utility monopolies that offer quality service."

The rapid rise of independent electricity producers comes at a time when there are the greatest disagreements in history over how much power America will need through the end of the century.

In Senate Energy Committee hearings in July, unsubtly titled "When Will the Lights Go Out?," it became clear that some utility executives and Reagan administration officials expect electricity use to grow approximately 3 percent annually, even with aggressive conservation programs.

The Edison Electric Institute (EEI), the industry's trade association, maintains this is so because advanced technologies like computers and robots require electricity. For that matter, so do metal workers who now use lasers to harden a metal in 10 minutes as much as they used to using a 24-

hour bath in a 1,000-degree-Fahrenheit nitride liquid. Moreover, advanced plastic plants employ electrically heated injection-molding machines, while textile and paper firms use microwave technology for drying.

According to "The Future of Electric Power in America," a 1983 Department of Energy report, meeting this demand and replacing a few oil-fired burners will require 438 new power plants by the year 2000, or approximately two large stations each month. Such expansion would cost \$1.8 trillion, approximately the size of the celebrated federal debt, which economists claim will raise interest rates and divert scarce capital from innovative businesses.

Other industry analysts, however, disagree. The Electricity Consumers Resource Council, an association of 19 major industrial users of electricity, including General Motors, Dupont and Bethlehem Steel, concludes that because of more efficient business processes, "there is no capacity limitation on a national basis that will cause severe electricity problems in either the short or long run."

Indeed, high electricity prices have sparked a revolution in the efficient use of electricity. In "intelligent buildings," computers interconnect heating, cooling and lighting controls for maximum energy management. Improved drive trains for electric motors, superinsulation in building construction and fluidized-bed heat treatment of metals are other conservation technologies that have been introduced only within the past few years. For that matter, a recently developed aluminum smelting process consumes 40 percent less electricity per pound than current technologies. Electricity is the most important raw material in the manufacturing of aluminum.

The vast differences among the opinions of these energy experts and the enormous expense of power plants make electricity planning more risky than ever before. For example, if generating capacity is built on the assumption that need will increase by 3 percent per year, and in fact growth is only 2 percent, that 1 percentage-point difference in the annual growth rate of electricity demand equals the equivalent of 100 large nuclear reactors by century's end, costing about \$400 billion.

Overbuilding could bankrupt the utility industry, while underestimating could cause energy shortages. Clearly, being far wrong either way is unacceptable. Which is why an increasing number of analysts think that the only rational approach is to create a flexible electricity system that can accurately respond to an uncertain demand for power.

It is under such circumstances that private electric entrepreneurs who can build small facilities quickly—rather than take 10 or 12 years to construct huge power plants that tend to go well over budget—begin to look especially promising.

How did our electricity futures get so dicey? In simpler days, utility managers predicted demand without crowds or controversy. Throughout the 1950s and 1960s, consumption of electricity regularly advanced about 7 percent each year, doubling every decade. Forecasters plotted the rise, confident that they could safely plan and build new generating facilities. But efficiencies of scale declined as power plants became larger and more complex. And as fuel costs soared, the growth of need for electricity dropped to 2.9 percent throughout the decade after the 1973 oil embargo.

Believing the cutbacks were only temporary, the Edison Electric Institute launched

a \$20-million advertising campaign in 1978 to declare, "The time to build power plants is now." But EEI was wrong. Expanding construction combined with reduced growth of consumption to produce a staggeringly expensive gap between how much electrical-generating capacity existed versus how much was needed. This was one of the reasons utility directors abandoned more than \$18 billion worth of investments in 114 proposed nuclear reactors, according to the Federal Energy Information Administration. Another 67 coal-fired plants were also cancelled.

Despite the cutbacks, the industry's surplus generating capacity—which engineers attempt to maintain at a 20 percent level to handle emergencies—rose to almost 40 percent recently. Today's excess generating capacity has nearly cost utility stockholders and rate-payers.

Some utility executives think the trend toward slower demand growth was reversed in 1984 when the end of the recession caused a 5.6 percent rise in nationwide electricity consumption. However, for the 52 weeks ending Sept. 28, the most recently reported period, electricity production was up only 1.7 percent over the previous year.

It was in the midst of this uncertainty in the mid-70s that the electricity industry appeared ripe for competition. New power plants increased rather than lowered rates. Moreover, high electricity prices and innovative technologies offered opportunities for independents to profitably supply power.

Utilities, as might be expected, tried to obstruct their new challengers by refusing to buy excess power or to supply back-up service. Politicians, however, facing the "energy crisis," wanted to substitute alternative energy technologies for imported oil. So lawmakers approved the Public Utility Regulatory Policies Act (PURPA) in 1978 to establish a market for power generated by entrepreneurs and to block utilities from discriminating against these new competitors.

Specifically, PURPA requires that the rates for transactions between independent producers and utilities "shall be just and reasonable and in the public interest, and shall not discriminate against the qualifying cogenerator or qualifying small power producers." The law forces a utility to buy such power at the price of its "avoided costs"—that is, what the electric company would have to spend to increase capacity to produce the same amount of power.

The actual computation is complex but basically, if an entrepreneur installs windmills that provide energy the utility would otherwise have had to build a new power plant to obtain, the utility must pay the independent producer the amount (per-kilowatt-hour) that it would have had to pay to capitalize, finance, fuel and operate that plant. Entrepreneurs generating power for less than that cost can turn a profit.

With PURPA in place and utility rates soaring, entrepreneurs quickly promoted an array of efficient technologies. The cogenerator—as tested machine—was the most popular, especially among petroleum refiners, wood and food processors, steel and chemical producers and other companies that need both heat and electric power.

The machine's advantage is efficiency and cost: A typical cogeneration unit costs \$800 to \$1,200 per kilowatt of capacity, less than half the price per kilowatt of a large new coal or nuclear plant. And it produces useful steam as icing on the cake. By late 1984, according to the International Cogeneration

Society, cogenerators produced more than 15,000 megawatts of power in the United States, matching the output of 15 nuclear reactors; another 200 projects with a total capacity of 6,000 megawatts were under construction.

Cogeneration users are a diverse lot. The S&W Cannery, for instance, burns peach pits and other wastes to provide the heat and electricity required by its Modesto, Calif., factory, which processes half the nation's canned peaches. Scott Paper Company incinerates waste wood at its Maine paper mills to generate 75 megawatts of electricity. And the Holiday Inn near New York's La Guardia Airport employs a small natural-gas-powered cogenerator that annually saves the hotel \$63,000 in heating and electricity costs.

A new breed of wind-energy entrepreneurs is also challenging utility monopolies. Southeast of San Francisco, about 100 new businesses have converted Altamont Pass into a "Silicon Valley" for wind energy development. Five years ago, the barren, rolling hills supported only a few head of cattle. Today, ranchers share their land with more than 2,500 windmills that convert the constant breezes into about 400 megawatts of electric power.

These multibillion-dollar developments, however, do not guarantee energy utopia. Some utilities and consumer groups worry that introducing competition could have a lot of the drawbacks noted in the breakup of AT&T—especially for the small residential user. The type of organization most likely to profit from the installation of a cogeneration unit, after all, is a factory. If entrepreneurs too quickly remove the most lucrative industrial customers from the utility system, it would be residential consumers who would be forced to pick up a bigger share of the power company's fixed costs—such as transmission lines.

Some environmentalists—especially in New England and the Pacific Northwest—also fear that independents will run amok, slapping low-head hydro dams on every wild and free river they can back a cement truck up to.

And industrial policy experts note that in return for their monopoly, regulated utilities are legally liable if they do not produce all the electricity their customers need. It is problematic who could be held responsible for inadequate supply if power companies relied on independent producers.

Thoughtful utility executives, however, are slowly modifying their opposition to buying electricity from entrepreneurs as they find it more economical than building their own central power stations. "It makes more sense," says Sebastian Nola, cogeneration manager at Southern California Edison, "for independents to risk their own capital than for the power company to finance expensive new construction."

Some utility executives even admit their industry's very foundations are being shaken. "The U.S. electric industry," concludes Douglas Bauer, EEI's executive vice president, "is in the midst of its greatest historical transition." With over-budget new facilities threatening to bankrupt their entire operation, and engineers having hit the point of diminishing returns with large units, utility executives can no longer argue that expanding their monopoly will lead to lower costs.

Therefore, efficiency may have to be achieved as in other industries—through competition.

In the brave new world of competitive electrical generators, a regulated or publicly

owned monopoly will probably still distribute the electricity, simply because building duplicate lines still does not make economic sense. Even limited competition among generators, however, will force producers to plan for and build only the most efficient plants possible and to keep operating cost low. If they don't, the distribution monopoly or individual consumers would buy power from cheaper suppliers.

Unlike today's system, where the central utility makes all forecasting decisions, many independent generators would participate in a competitive market. While a few generating companies may go bankrupt because of forecasting errors, diversity could provide more overall security than today's centralization, where a single utility's mistake can harm all the customers in a given region.

No one expects today's utility companies to abandon operations or expire, even though the days of high power stations seem to be waning. Just as General Electric and other large engineering firms are shifting their efforts from centralized plants to cogenerators, so will utilities try to adjust and prosper in a competitive market. Those that continue to rely on outmoded practices will suffer.

In essence, a new social contract is being created between electricity producers and consumers, one based on competition rather than monopolies and regulation. Some utility executives will certainly exercise their substantial political muscle to oppose independent power suppliers and to demand a return to more centralized control. But market forces have quickly converted efficient and dispersed technologies into multibillion-dollar businesses. Today's utilities are losing their monopolies to a new generation of electric entrepreneurs.

#### WORLD FOOD DAY

#### HON. CARLOS J. MOORHEAD

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 17, 1985

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, Yesterday in a Capitol Hill setting, at a ceremony hosted by the Select Committee on Hunger and attended by the Postmaster General of the United States, 10 individuals received citations for their extraordinary efforts to end world hunger. From all parts of the country, all ages and walks of life they came, in honor of the first day of issue of a U.S. Postal Service stamp bearing the legend "Help End Hunger". One of the persons honored, Dorsey Lawson of Pasadena, CA, came from the 22d District of California which I represent.

Dorsey Lawson is not just dedicated to this cause; for her it is a way of life. The name of her support group really says it all, "Results." Dorsey by her steadfast devotion to a cause shows us all what it takes to make a difference in the lives of others. Dorsey represents the meaning of individual effort at its very best. She never forgets, and she never lets you forget, and we are all the better for it.

Today is World Food Day 1985; a day on which we can truly celebrate the good news that since 1961, 51 countries representing over 1.5 billion people have ended hunger as a national issue within their borders. It

is also a day during which we can pay homage to Dorsey Lawson and her counterparts all over this Earth for their remarkable efforts to first bring the crisis to our attention, to take action and then most important of all to be able to show results. That is what this day is all about and that is what Dorsey Lawson is all about.

#### BOYS BROTHERHOOD REPUBLIC

#### HON. BILL GREEN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 17, 1985

Mr. GREEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to commend the work of the Boys Brotherhood Republic, a nonprofit organization located on the Lower East Side of Manhattan in New York City. The BBR, which has, at times, been called the world's smallest democracy, was founded in Chicago in 1914. In 1932, Mayor Fiorello LaGuardia brought this organization to New York City in hopes of offsetting the negative effects of the Depression on the city's youth. Today, the BBR continues to educate its members about the need to be a positive and productive force in society.

The BBR serves over 2,200 young men from the ages of 7 to 19. These youth are the children of disadvantaged families, mainly residing in a community marked by crime, drugs, abandoned buildings, and low-income housing. The BBR has been able to reach out and steer them in playing a more positive role in their community.

The BBR has succeeded in curbing juvenile delinquency. The motto, "Boys are not likely to break the rules, if they are given the opportunity to make the rules," has held true for this organization. Members learn by doing rather than by being lectured to by adults. They begin to understand and respect the rights of fellow citizens. The BBR fosters a close sense of community feeling and responsibility.

The BBR seeks to build good character, citizenship, and a belief in responsible democracy. Its citizens become acquainted with democratic processes by participating in its own form of self-government. They actively elect a mayor, city clerk, treasurer, chief of police, city manager, councilmen, and so forth, to a city government. Every citizen must also participate in a BBR committee. The functions of the committees range from preserving order and overseeing violations of the BBR constitution to tutoring fellow members on homework. BBR members learn to be productive citizens and leaders. They are encouraged to look into their future and recognize their potential for growth.

More recently, the BBR, in cooperation with Touro College in New York City, opened the School of Career and Urban Studies in the Lower East Side. This new school, focused on attracting disadvantaged young adults and senior citizens in the community, encourages them to gain economic and social self-sufficiency. Once again, the BBR has shown its commitment



to the community. With such a commitment, this new venture can only prove to be a success.

**KQV RADIO MARKS 10TH YEAR  
AS PITTSBURGH'S ALL-NEWS  
RADIO STATION**

**HON. DOUG WALGREN**

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 17, 1985

Mr. WALGREN. Mr. Speaker, on October 15, 1975, KQV Radio in Pittsburgh became the only station in western Pennsylvania to adopt an all-news format to inform the populace about events in our world which affect their daily lives. This week marks the 10th anniversary of the station's exclusive all-news service to hundreds of thousands of citizens in the Greater Pittsburgh area.

Further, within the next few months, the station will mark its 66th anniversary of regularly scheduled broadcasting, with many historians noting that it may be the oldest in the United States; broadcasting experimentally as early as 1919.

I hope the House of Representatives will note the 10th anniversary of KQV news-radio as an event of singular importance and a laudatory step in keeping our citizens informed. All-news radio stations perform a tremendous public service, and I salute KQV Radio, its owner, manager, and news team for a job well done.

**GROUND BREAKING CEREMONY  
FOR THE U.S. HOLOCAUST MEMORIAL MUSEUM**

**HON. LAWRENCE J. SMITH**

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 17, 1985

Mr. SMITH of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to urge my colleagues to read the speeches inserted in the October 16 and 17, 1985, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD regarding yesterday's long-awaited groundbreaking for the U.S. Holocaust Memorial Museum in Washington, DC.

I specifically would like to direct my colleagues to the moving remarks of Eli Weisel. As a Jew who has personally suffered family losses, I know the pain Professor Weisel speaks of when we remember the Nazi genocide committed against the Jewish people and I feel the loss of each life as if it were my own. Each survivor has their own story and private nightmare. Hitler's reign ended 40 years ago, but for the many who survived the camps, the hiding, and the awful waiting, it happened yesterday. Therefore, we will continue to remember the Nazi barbarism through the erection of this national Holocaust Memorial Museum so we can prevent this atrocity from happening again.

To my colleagues who were unable to attend yesterday's ceremony, let me tell you it was unlike any groundbreaking cere-

mony that I have ever attended. Dirt and ashes from concentration camps were in urns marked Auschwitz, Bergen-Belsen, Dachau, Theresienstadt, Treblinka and the Warsaw Jewish Cemetery and were emptied and mixed into the soil designated for the Holocaust Memorial Museum. What was not evident to the observer was the dirt and ashes. The urns from the concentration camps symbolize the mothers and fathers, children and grandchildren who were uprooted, imprisoned, tortured, and murdered at the hands of the Nazis.

The Holocaust changed the face of Judaism and history. Families were separated, villages and communities destroyed, and Jewish objects of religious and family life were confiscated. The Jewish heritage suffered a violation; family histories and heirlooms were lost forever. I pledge to the survivors of the Holocaust that we will not forget, and we have not forgotten.

**YOUTH AWARENESS WEEK**

**HON. NANCY L. JOHNSON**

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 17, 1985

Mrs. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to the attention of the Congress the extraordinary services of two community organizations in my district—the Torrington Youth Services Bureau and the Winsted Area Youth Services Bureau. Next Sunday will be the kickoff for a jointly sponsored community event and begin a week-long recognition of the contributions and the problems of local young people. The week of October 20 has been designated "Youth Awareness Week" by these creative innovative organizations.

During this week there will be ceremonies to recognize and praise the outstanding achievements and contributions of local youth. There will also be special workshops for adolescents, parents, and teachers, and seminars of interest and importance to the whole community.

This celebration will begin with a parade on Sunday, after which there will be an awards ceremony honoring the contributions and accomplishments of the young men and women of our towns in such areas as community service, art, and written communication. Throughout the balance of this week there will be seminars on parent effectiveness training, substance abuse recognition, adolescent depression, and teenage suicide. In addition, there will be family oriented activities, a community food drive, and a special junior high night.

Mr. Speaker, I bring your attention to "Youth Awareness Week" not only to praise the dedicated people who so sensitively and effectively planned it, but to offer this event as a model for other communities who are searching for new ways to develop a successful partnership between the community, its families, and its youth. The activities of "Youth Awareness Week," the products of a year's work, reflect the needs, demands and pressures of today's

society. Again, I congratulate the people of Torrington and Winsted on their insightful dedication to the leaders of tomorrow.

**CHARLES J. RAIMONDO—1985  
MAN OF THE YEAR**

**HON. ROBERT G. TORRICELLI**

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 17, 1985

Mr. TORRICELLI. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Charles J. Raimondo, an outstanding citizen of Fort Lee, NJ, will be honored as "1985 Man of the Year" at the Boys' Town of Italy 40th anniversary dinner of the Bergen County chapter on October 20, 1985. This deserving invitation was extended to Mr. Raimondo by the Right Reverend Monsignor John Patrick Carroll-Abbing, president of Boys' Town of Italy in Rome, Italy.

Charles "Chick" Raimondo is married to the former Janice Cammarata of Cliffside Park, NJ, and is the father of four children: Jacey, Charles, Jr., Shari, and Nancy. He was educated at Fort Lee High School, Bowling Green University in Ohio, Columbia University in New York, and Fairleigh Dickinson University in New Jersey. Mr. Raimondo served in the U.S. Navy Reserve and Active Reserve. He is now assigned to the Bureau of Yards and Docks, working on projects including the rehabilitation of naval facilities and the Third Naval District Coastal Defense for design and construction.

Mr. Raimondo has been a resident of Fort Lee for 40 years and has spent his career with C. Raimondo & Sons Construction Co., Inc., of Fort Lee. Chick is now president of the firm which his father, Carmelo, founded in 1923. He is presently director of the board of directors of the Fort Lee Savings & Loan Association; a member of the Fort Lee Parking Authority, the Fort Lee Mayor's Council on Economic Development, the Palisades Interstate Park Commission, the Fort Lee High School Athletic Football Committee, the Boy Scouts of America; and is chairman of the Fort Lee March of Dimes, and the Fort Lee and Englewood Cliffs Chamber of Commerce. Chick is a registered member of the National Association of Home Builders, a member of the New Jersey Chiefs Association, the New York Athletic Club, the New Jersey State P.B.A., the Bergen County Private Industry Council, and trustee of the Hudson County District Council of Laborers' Benefit Fund.

Chick's dedication to the principles which have made him a success in business are a reflection of the dedication he exhibits to his family and community. In addition to his many community activities, Chick has the well-deserved reputation as one who can always be counted on to lend a hand to those in need.

From dawn to dusk, the life commitment of our versatile honoree by the Boys' Town of Italy suggests that his mainstay is to "apply the same positive and thorough ap-

proach in one's community, business, and personal activities." This is evident as he commits his almost unlimited energy to community services, youth groups, and many different charities. As a concerned citizen, Chick has the all-important keystone—an ability to take the skeleton of an idea and engineer it from the basement to the case-ment to the rooftop to its final elevation.

Chick is that rare individual; a dedicated citizen to his family, his hometown of Fort Lee, NJ, to the State of New Jersey and his country. On October 20, 1985, I would like to join Chick's family and many friends as they pay tribute to my good friend when the Boys' Town of Italy honors him as their "Man of the Year."

#### TRIBUTE TO B.W. "BUD" LEE

#### HON. ROBERT J. LAGOMARSINO

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 17, 1985

Mr. LAGOMARSINO. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues the achievements and retirement of my constituent, B.W. "Bud" Lee of Ventura, CA. Bud is retiring on December 27, 1985, after 40 years of distinguished service to California agriculture, including 32½ years with University of California Cooperative Extension and 7½ years with the California Department of Agriculture.

He is a native Californian, born in Los Angeles and raised in Pomona. He graduated from Pomona High School and Pomona Junior College before transferring to the University of California at Davis and then to the University of California at Berkeley. World War II interrupted his schooling when he entered the U.S. Maritime Academy where he received a commission in both the U.S. merchant marine and Naval Reserve. After 4 years of service he returned to University of California at Berkeley, graduating in 1946.

Bud was employed by the California Department of Agriculture Bureau of Plant Pathology until joining University of California Cooperative Extension in May 1953. He served as citrus farm adviser in Los Angeles County until transferring to Ventura County in May 1957. In February 1966 he was appointed county director and farm adviser and assumed responsibility for administration, avocados and minor subtropical fruit. His activities and assistance in solving a number of major problems include liaison between the University of California Board of Regents and Ventura County Board of Supervisors, Effective Educational and Field Research Program for the citrus industries of Ventura County. He has authored or coauthored 105 articles and publications and many other activities too numerous to enumerate.

Bud is a member of numerous professional societies and industry committees including American Society of Horticultural Science, California Rare Fruit Growers, Florida State Horticultural Society, California Avocado Society, Avocado Nursery-

man's Society, Citrus Research Advisory Board, and many others.

In 1973 he received the California Avocado Society Award of Honor and in 1984 he was recognized with the Distinguished Service Award for Outstanding Teaching by the University of California Cooperative Extension Assembly Council.

To summarize, Bud's supportive style as a manager and his expertise as a farm adviser and significant contributions to the avocado and citrus industries, leave a lasting legacy. His national and international recognition as a teacher and researcher is a direct result of his contributions and professionalism.

I wish Bud and his wife Nancy all the best in his well-deserved retirement.

#### RECEIVES POSTHUMOUS AWARD

#### HON. BUD SHUSTER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 17, 1985

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Speaker, I stand here today to pay tribute to Army Sgt. William D. Port of Petersburg, PA. Sergeant Port served in Vietnam, and was declared missing in action on January 12, 1968. Army officials later declared him dead after it was learned he died of wounds in prison on November 27, 1969. Sergeant Port received the Medal of Honor posthumously August 6, 1970.

William Port and his unit were involved in a combat operation against the enemy in the Que Son Valley on January 12, 1968. His unit came under heavy fire and was forced to withdraw. Sergeant Port was wounded during the withdrawal, and without regard for his safety ran through the heavy fire, and through the platoon perimeter to help a wounded comrade back to the safety of our lines. As the enemy forces assaulted his position, an enemy grenade landed in the midst of Sergeant Port and three fellow servicemen. Sergeant Port hurled himself toward the grenade shielding his comrades. He was wounded, taken prisoner and died in a Vietnamese prisoner of war camp. The Vietnamese have held his remains until recently when they turned them over to American officials.

On Friday, October 18, 1985, Sgt. William Port will be honored at Arlington Cemetery where he will finally be able to rest in peace surrounded by men like himself who selflessly gave their lives so that we might enjoy the freedom our great country affords us. I salute you Sgt. William D. Port for your heroism which reflects great credit upon yourself and your country.

#### HEARING EXAMINES HEALTH HAZARD OF PROLONGED RADON GAS EXPOSURE

#### HON. GUS YATRON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 17, 1985

Mr. YATRON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to acknowledge and commend three recent initiatives addressing indoor radon gas contamination. On October 10, 1985, Congressman JAMES SCHEUER, as chairman of the Subcommittee on Natural Resources, Agriculture Research and Environment, held a hearing to examine the health hazards of prolonged radon gas exposure and the current level and appropriateness of Federal and State efforts to identify and mitigate indoor radon. The hearing drew welcome and much-needed attention to this very serious environmental problem. Among the witnesses who testified at the hearing were four of my constituents from Boyertown, PA, in whose homes this deadly gas was first identified. Testimony on the health effects of radon gas inhalation was also provided by scientists.

The initial conclusions I drew from the hearing confirm the opinion I have held since first learning of the existence and seriousness of radon gas in thousands of homes in my district. The health risks are extraordinary—the Environmental Protection Agency estimates that between 5,000 and 30,000 lung cancer deaths each year can be attributed to radon gas exposure—and the Federal Government has an obligation to do much more than currently is to mitigate the radon in homes on the Reading Prong. This, I believe, is the responsible public health policy to assume, regardless of the fact that this substance is naturally occurring and is most pervasively and perniciously found in homes where Federal environmental laws and regulations have not been applied. I would like to commend Chairman SCHEUER for holding the hearing and I urge all of our colleagues to join in the efforts many of us are making to adequately address this serious national concern.

I would also like to thank Pennsylvania Gov. Richard Thornburgh for establishing the Nation's first low interest loan program for radon mitigation purchases by affected homeowners. Announcing the program last Thursday, Governor Thornburgh said, "Although radon is a national problem certainly not limited to the Reading Prong, we simply can't wait any longer for the development of a national program." The loan program will provide 2 percent interest rates for low and moderate-income families with annual incomes under \$36,000. Loans at 8 to 9 percent will be available for families with incomes over \$36,000 annually. This \$3 million program is, to date, the most that has been offered to citizens living in contaminated homes. It is a good beginning but the Federal Government, specifically the EPA, ought to be providing further assistance for homes contaminated



at emergency levels. While we continue to press for additional Federal support, the Commonwealth's financial assistance is a welcome resource for the many citizens affected by this problem.

I would finally like to recognize my colleague from Pennsylvania, Congressman BOB EDGAR, for his successful effort to amend the Superfund bill developed by the Public Works and Transportation Committee. The stronger Public Works Superfund reauthorization now includes a \$4 million allotment for a national assessment and a larger demonstration program to be conducted by EPA. I commend Congressman EDGAR and urge my colleagues to support this bill and its amendment on radon.

I commend all these initiatives and encourage further endeavors in the development of a more appropriate and responsible public policy for addressing this very serious environmental health concern.

#### FAMILY PLANNING IN PERIL

#### HON. PATRICIA SCHROEDER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 17, 1985

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to my colleagues' attention an excellent speech delivered recently by our colleague, Representative BOB EDGAR of Pennsylvania. He accurately spells out the crisis which could befall our Nation's family planning programs if we don't act now. I commend this thoughtful piece to my colleagues:

#### FAMILY PLANNING IN PERIL

(By Bob Edgar)

As you know, Agency for International Development (AID) Administrator Peter McPherson recently announced that natural family planning groups will be allowed to use federal money to go into third world countries and set up family clinics which offer only one option: natural family planning.

The Philadelphia Daily News commented that—"It is bad enough when one-sided thinking becomes domestic policy when there is at least a semblance of open debate. But it borders on criminal to offer this narrow version of reality to people who may have no other source of information and may end up getting nothing from the U.S. but the promise of more babies they can watch go hungry."

This policy is simply a continuation of the conservatives' campaign, begun at the United Nations Population Conference in Mexico City, to prevent women in the third world from exercising freedom of choice. I find it repulsive to think of an African woman, children in tow on her hip and at her skirts, walking into a clinic, proud but afraid, only to be told her only option in limiting the growth of her family is to abstain. Ignorance is certainly not bliss.

Will the same thing happen on the domestic front?

Now imagine if you will the scenario so clearly depicted by the columnist Ellen Goodman:

"A woman goes into a family planning clinic in any American city, looking for a way to limit or space her children. The

clinic gives her information about 'natural family planning' an updated version of rhythm." She then asks how effective this method might be. "She will be told that among careful users 24 percent will become pregnant during one year." "Let us now imagine," Goodman continues, "that she gulps and asks what else the clinic has to offer. The answer she gets is nothing."

Goodman painted this scenario in order for us to better see what the American equivalent of the recent AID decision would look like. We need to understand its terrible implications for the third world. I submit to you that there are those of the new right, who given the chance, would see such a scenario in the U.S. as their ultimate goal.

What we have on our hands now is a fight to preserve the Title X program as we know it. In the five county Southeastern Pennsylvania region alone, 90,000 people are served each year; in the whole Commonwealth, a quarter million. As you know, Title X funding represents the single largest source of support for family planning in Pennsylvania. These funds are used for early cancer detection, blood tests for anemia and diabetes, screening and treatment of sexually transmitted diseases, provision of contraceptive supplies, pregnancy testing, and infertility services.

No title X funding is used for abortions. Unfortunately, the "new right" is trying to use the abortion issue to effectively destroy Title X. This past summer, we tried to get the Title X program extended for another three years. Unfortunately, since the bill was being considered under a procedure which prohibits the addition of amendments, and since opponents labeled it a pro-abortion bill in order to evoke knee-jerk opposition, the bill was defeated. It received a majority of the votes, but because of the no-amendment stipulation, it needed to get two-thirds of the votes to pass.

This defeat does not mean that Title X is dead. All it means is that when we consider it again on the Floor of the House, it will be subject to amendment. I recently learned that one of our more conservative members of Congress is going to offer an amendment which says, "no funds may be awarded to any organization that provides abortion procedures, counseling for abortion procedures, or referral for abortion procedures, unless the life of the woman may be endangered by carrying the fetus to term."

The consequences of this on a practical level are that Crozer-Chester, Jefferson and University of Pennsylvania Hospitals are no longer going to be able to get Title X funding unless they eliminate abortion or counseling services, or referral for such services.

If this happens, we will have a choice between drastically limiting the flow of family planning information and services in our community or the first steps to the return to the days of back room abortions.

We can't let this happen again.

Title X has been a triumph of a modern society. We must fight to keep it intact.

I have in my hands here evidence that we can win this fight. I am holding a few hundred cards that I have received from you over the last month demanding that we keep Title X as it is, unamended.

These cards represent the first step in taking this program into your own hands and fighting for what you believe is right.

The most important thing we can do is demand positive leadership. We need advocates of family planning to stave off enactment of the right wing agenda, which essentially means the elimination of family planning. We can't afford to lose this battle.

#### KIDS FOR KIDS HELP STARVING ETHIOPIANS

#### HON. JAMES J. FLORIO

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 17, 1985

Mr. FLORIO. Mr. Speaker, as we commemorate World Food Day, I wanted to direct the attention of my colleagues to an important effort that is taking place in my district this month. On October 1, 1985, the Camden County Kids for Kids launched a month-long fund drive to collect money for the starving in Ethiopia. Those involved have, through this effort, demonstrated a spirit of humanitarianism and dedication that is commendable and I hope that their efforts will set a precedent for communities throughout the Nation.

Mr. Speaker, 33 public, private, and parochial school districts in Camden County are currently involved in their goal of raising \$150,000 for African famine relief. We have become increasingly aware of a different world, on the other side of the Atlantic, where the lack of food and water is a fact of life. Millions of men, women, and children are dying in Africa because they do not have food, water, or any of the basics we are fortunate enough to call essentials. Africa is experiencing the worst famine and drought of the century with 30 million people affected.

We are periodically stunned by pictures of living skeletons on the evening news—human beings slowly waiting to die because they can do nothing more. Over 20 million people around the world starve to death each year. More people have died in the past 5 years of hunger than in all the revolutions, wars, and murders of the past 150 years. A continent is disintegrating before our very eyes and it is up to us to ensure that this does not happen. The irony of this entire situation is that there is enough food produced to supply every human on the planet with enough for a proper diet.

I would like to commend the participants of the Camden County Kids for Kids Fund Drive for the energy that they have expended for this cause and to encourage them to persevere in reaching their goal. In particular, the efforts of Collingswood High School teacher Frances Grossman, who is organizing this effort after having been inspired by a similar effort in New York City last spring, have been instrumental in the drive. Fran spent this past summer organizing the logistics of the drive and has been the prime force behind this effort. Special recognition should be accorded to Fran's boss, Collingswood High School principal, Edward Sandal, the principal of Triton Regional High School, Louis Cappelli, Sr., and the principal of Zane North and Garfield Elementaries, Wayne Cochran. They have devoted their time and energy toward helping a continent survive.

The success of the drive depends on the diligent students that have pledged their dedication to this cause. In particular, Coleen O'Connell of Collingswood High,

Thea Dilger of Triton Regional High School, and Nekea Coleman, an elementary school student from Camden, have worked especially hard in garnering support among their peers and rekindling the humanitarian spirit of the citizens of Camden County. Students are currently collecting money at school and in their neighborhoods, holding walk-a-thons, flea markets, and car washes, donating the price of a school lunch each week, and trying to organize a benefit concert.

As these students go door to door and participate in the many events surrounding this effort, they will not just be raising funds to keep children from starving. They will also be making sure that people here do not forget about those starving on the other side of the ocean. Mr. Speaker, I was touched by the concern and caring that has been expressed throughout this whole effort, and I urge my colleagues to join me in congratulating Camden County Kids for Kids.

#### HONORING FRED SORSABAL

#### HON. ROBERT E. BADHAM

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 17, 1985

Mr. BADHAM. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor one of the Nation's truly outstanding municipal leaders, Mr. Fred Sorsabal, who on October 25, 1985, ended 15 years of superior service as city manager of Costa Mesa, CA.

Mr. Sorsabal, a native of Orange County, CA, leaves his prestigious post to assume a new and challenging role working full-time for the El Bekal Shrine Temple and seeking election as its 1986 potentate.

To say that Fred Sorsabal has been involved in the life of his community would be an understatement. In addition to his 26 years of public service, he has found the time to be a member of the board of directors of the Girl Scout Council of Orange County, a member of the Executive Committee of the Orange County United Way, president of the Harbor Area United Way and an extremely active member of the El Bekal Shrine Temple, with its many good works and community service.

During Mr. Sorsabal's service as city manager, the city of Costa Mesa has grown and emerged as one of the finest municipalities in America. Its citizens have the benefits of excellent schools, businesses, commercial centers and soon, one of the Nation's most remarkable and exciting performing arts and cultural centers. Of course, much of the success Costa Mesa has enjoyed during the last decade and a half is due to the commitment of those citizen leaders who have served as members of the city council. However, their wishes and those of the electorate have been carried out effectively, creatively and proficiently by Mr. Sorsabal and the staff he has assembled and led these past 15 years.

Fred Sorsabal has left an indelible mark of progress and achievement on the city of

Costa Mesa and Orange County. His dedication to his responsibilities set a high standard of excellence for those in public service. As he moves forward to devote his energies to the selfless community service work of the Shrine Temple, those who know him are certain this new task will be met with the same vigor and enthusiasm he brought to the city of Costa Mesa.

#### THE 75TH ANNIVERSARY OF MOUNT CARMEL CHURCH, POUGHKEEPSIE, NY

#### HON. HAMILTON FISH, JR.

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 17, 1985

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, Sunday marks the 75th anniversary celebration of Mount Carmel Church in the city of Poughkeepsie, NY.

Over the last 75 years, Mount Carmel Church has stood as a symbol of the great strides made by Poughkeepsie's Italian immigrants, who have enriched the Queen City along the majestic Hudson River since the early 1900's.

Those immigrants came to this country to find employment opportunities and liberty. One of the first things they did after arriving in this country was to build a church, which would become Mount Carmel Roman Catholic Church. Using borrowed money, construction started on a yellow brick structure.

At the outset, Mount Carmel became one of Poughkeepsie's national churches, serving one of the city's numerous ethnic groups.

But it was more than just a place of worship. It was the community meeting place—a place where neighbors talked, exchanged ideas, and planned for the future.

In 1932, at the direction of the late Bishop Joseph Pernicone, who was Mount Carmel's young pastor at the time, the church community built a school, which was dedicated in 1935. Since that time, 2,500 students have passed through the school's halls.

Again, it was the community that raised the money in the beginning to operate the school.

The church and school still stand in Poughkeepsie's little Italy. Many of the area's former residents return to their old neighborhood regularly.

Mount Carmel and the community it serves have realized an American dream. Through hard work and perseverance, the children of the first immigrants have become part of this country's culture.

Congratulation to the church and its many loyal parishioners.

#### WILL SAYS IT WELL—AGAIN

#### HON. BUD SHUSTER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 17, 1985

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Speaker, I commend the following article by George Will, which appeared in the October 17, 1985 Washington Post, to my colleagues:

GEORGE F. WILL AND FELLOW-TRAVELERS

Anger is indeed valor's whetstone and the valor of the Americans, from the president to the pilots, is clear. But so is this: the interception of the terrorists underscores the limits of U.S. anti-terrorism policy, and the aftermath of the episode has enhanced the PLO.

The United States finally acted against terrorists because it had a highly unusual and unlikely-to-be-repeated opportunity for nonviolent action. It was an act compatible with the administration's "Miranda Rule" approach—fastidious about procedure—to anti-terrorism.

In the aftermath, three nations—one a member of NATO, another counted an ally, the third considered an example of "civilized communism"—showed that they value good relations with the PLO more than with the United States. Or perhaps the point should be put this way: the three nations' fear of PLO anger is palpable, their fear of U.S. anger is negligible.

A Third World ethicist, identified by The New York Times as a "senior Egyptian official," explained to The Times: A lie here is simply not the same as a lie in your country." He got that right. The president of Egypt lied repeatedly, extravagantly, transparently as he collaborated with the masterminds of the terror, trying to spirit to safety the killers of an American. Four days later this was a Washington Post headline: "U.S. Seeks to Soothe Egypt."

Who seeks to soothe whom? In the Third World, pride often is inversely proportional to the justification of it. The U.S. ambassador in Cairo says Egyptians are proud people. One yearns for the year when their overflowing pride will manifest itself in refusal to pocket billions of dollars from U.S. taxpayers.

Italy's government violated an extradition treaty with the United States and almost certainly facilitated the stealthy flight of a particularly odious terrorist to Eastern Europe. The Reagan administration called this Italian action "inexplicable," a polite description of an act completely comprehensible as appeasement of terrorists.

Then Yugoslavia, from which nothing better could be expected, violated an extradition treaty with the United States and compounded the offense with an offensive explanation, saying the terrorist has diplomatic immunity. The PLO, a terrorist organization has an "embassy" in Zagreb.

There is a similarity between the context of the terrorist interception and the context of the Grenada operation. Grenada came shortly after a stunning military defeat—the truck bomb against the Marines that did so much to drive U.S. forces from Lebanon. Considered in the context of the debacle in Lebanon, Grenada suggested that the United States is temperamentally prepared to use military power only in its region and only when the use can be completed quickly, before Sam Donaldson (meaning television) arrives.



The interception of the terrorists came a week after, and in the context of, U.S. acquiescence in the U.N. condemnation of Israel for attacking the PLO's headquarters in Tunisia. Israel's sin was that it practiced what the United States preaches: "No sanctuary for terrorists."

Considered in the context of the U.S. refusal to veto the U.N. condemnation of Israel, the U.S. interception of the terrorists emphasizes the administration's highly restrictive criteria for anti-terrorism. It will censure actions taken even against obvious sources of terrorism, such as PLO headquarters in Tunisia. It will act only against particular terrorists specifically identified with isolated deeds, and only when it can act without jeopardizing bystanders. The administration says "if an opportunity presents itself we will do exactly the same thing again." "Exactly"? Exactly: no more.

The message of the interception was supposed to be "you can run but can't hide." But terrorists routinely do both. They use civilians, first as fodder and then to hide behind. Low-level terrorists with blood on their hands have little to fear, and their leaders have nothing to fear, from a U.S. government that brings to anti-terrorism a self-defeating desire to assign direct, individual culpability for particular acts of violence sponsored by organizations. This is a policy of striking only at the fingers rather than the brain of terrorism. We are bringing to the war against terrorism the same warlike restraint that, 15 years ago, had U.S. fighter planes chasing individual trucks on the Ho Chi Minh Trail, while North Vietnam's dikes were spared.

Soon the U.S. government will utter the usual lubricating pleasantries, and Egypt's president and other fellow-travelers of terrorism will grudgingly, and for a profit, forgive us for the injuries they have done to us. The United States has won a battle but has lost the aftermath.

#### EX-PRESIDENTS' BENEFITS

**HON. LEE H. HAMILTON**

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 17, 1985

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to insert my Washington Report for Wednesday, October 16, 1985, into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

#### EX-PRESIDENTS' BENEFITS

Several debates on generous federal benefits for ex-Presidents have finally resulted in a consensus in Congress behind reform, and with good reason. Over the past 30 years, the annual cost of benefits for former Presidents has risen from \$64,000 to \$27 million. They now cost more than running the White House. At a time of major cutbacks in federal spending, benefits for ex-Presidents cannot be exempt from scrutiny.

Federal support for ex-Presidents is relatively new. For most of our history, Presidents had to look out for themselves once they left office. Some lived out their lives comfortably, while others, such as Presidents Jefferson and Jackson, died virtually penniless. Ex-Presidents earned their livelihoods from everything from potato farming or endorsing tooth powder to teaching law or writing their memoirs. Several turned down lucrative business offers because they thought it detracted from the dignity of the Presidency. Not until the growth of the

modern Presidency after World War II were federal benefits finally provided to ex-Presidents to help them lead dignified lives free from financial worry. Concern was expressed about the thousands of dollars that President Truman was spending from his own pocket to reply to letters or requests for speeches, and it was pointed out that an ex-President was virtually the only employee of the federal government not covered by some retirement program. In 1955, Congress approved funds to maintain Presidential libraries, and in 1958 authorized an annual allowance of \$25,000 for each ex-President, and provided each with staff assistance, an office, and free mailing privileges. Secret Service protection was added in 1962.

Today, benefits for ex-Presidents are substantial. Each is eligible to receive an annual pension of \$86,000, staff allowances of \$150,000 per year (dropping to \$96,000 after 30 months), a free furnished office at a location of his choice, around-the-clock protection by 24 Secret Service agents (8 per shift), free mailing, maintenance of Presidential libraries (constructed with private funds), health care services at military hospitals, and travel allowances. Some pension and Secret Service benefits are also provided to wives and children of ex-Presidents.

Supporters of these benefits claim that we must allow an outgoing President to take care of post-White House demands with some dignity, that former Presidents are a national resource, and that they earned through their public service whatever benefits they receive. They also point out that in 1984 we spent more on Secret Service protection for various announced Presidential candidates than we spent on all types of ex-President benefits combined. Critics, on the other hand, say that our former Presidents are highly visible national symbols who should set examples of budgetary restraint. They also point out that ex-Presidents command enormous fees by virtue of having once been President. President Ford, for example, reportedly earns more than a million dollars a year through consulting fees, sitting on a dozen boards of directors, and talking to business groups at \$18,000-\$20,000 per speech.

My impression is that some of these benefits are excessive, and should be trimmed. Of the \$27 million appropriated this year for ex-Presidents, the largest chunk, almost \$16 million, goes to operate the 7 Presidential libraries. Although the libraries are built with private funds, the federal government pays to maintain them, and costs have been much higher than expected. Moreover, these buildings are more like large monuments than libraries, since fewer than 1% of their visitors are researchers. One major step under consideration, which I favor, would restrict the size of future Presidential libraries and require ex-Presidents to raise money not just for the construction of their libraries, but also for an endowment to help underwrite maintenance. The Reagan Administration supports this proposal, provided the planned Reagan Library is exempt. I also think that small entrance fees to Presidential libraries could be charged, and that we should consider setting up one large central depository for Presidential papers. In addition, savings could come from the \$10 million it costs each year to provide Secret Service protection for ex-Presidents and their families. Critics say that there have been no direct threats to any of the former Presidents, and that Secret Service agents often double as chauffeurs and caddies. My guess is that Congress may be cautious

about cutting back Secret Service protection during the current wave of international terrorism. Pensions plus office and staff expenses cost the remaining \$1 million. Efforts are underway to reduce some of these expenses the longer the President has been out of office, to tighten oversight of allowable expenditures, and to bar the use of public funds for political or money-making purposes.

These efforts are important, but they must be supplemented with a different kind of reform in our treatment of ex-Presidents. We must change not only the way we provide benefits, but also the way we use ex-Presidents. The explosion since the 1950s of benefits to ex-Presidents is based partly on a recognition that ex-Presidents are a national resource. We provide funds so that they can live comfortably and with dignity. In practice, however, we still fail to take advantage of the special abilities ex-Presidents offer. Suggestions for using our ex-Presidents better include giving them seats, without voting rights, in the Senate, expanding their roles as special ambassadors, and appointing them to head up special commissions on major public questions, such as the successful Hoover Commission on government reorganization. We have had 31 ex-Presidents in our 200-year history. We should do all we can to encourage the use of the talents and experience of former occupants of the White House in further public service.

Much can be done to end wasteful public expenditures on ex-Presidents. We can also do much to improve our use of former Presidents. (Please help me update my mailing lists by notifying me of any incorrect or duplicate mailings.)

#### CONGRESSIONAL HIGH-TECHNOLOGY AWARDS PRESENTED

**HON. MERVYN M. DYMALLY**

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 17, 1985

Mr. DYMALLY. Mr. Speaker, I am elated with the success of the Annual Congressional Science and Technology Awards Ceremony and Banquet. I am pleased to inform the Members that on October 2, 1985, the Congressional Caucus for Science and Technology along with its research arm, the Congressional Institute for Space, Science and Technology, held their annual awards ceremony and banquet to honor a number of people who have made outstanding contributions to the area of science policy and to the application of scientific research and technical development. Three of our most outstanding colleagues in the Congress: Representative MANUEL LUJAN, JR., Senator ERNEST F. HOLLINGS, and Senator JAKE GARN were among the distinguished honorees. I wish to submit to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a copy of the press release which gives further details about the awards.

#### CONGRESSIONAL CAUCUS AWARDS INNOVATORS IN SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY

Fifteen individuals and organizations are winners of the 1985 Congressional High Technology Awards for their outstanding contributions to the advancement of science

and technology. The Awards presentation launched various nationwide activities during October, which has been designated National High Technology Month by Congress and was signed into law by President Reagan last month.

Technological innovations permeate every aspect of our daily lives. They affect the way we live, work, communicate and learn. Yet, innovators in science and technology often do not get the public recognition they deserve. National High Technology Month provides unique opportunities to heighten the public awareness, particularly of America's children, about the importance of scientific and technological advances.

National High Technology Month distinguishes the people who are making significant contributions to science and technology. At the same time, National High Technology Month provides a forum to promote educational opportunities on important social and moral issues surrounding science and high technology.

The following private sector individuals and companies are the recipients of this coveted award: Lionel Baldwin, President, National Technological University; Giuseppe Cecchi, Chairman, IDI/Techworld; Adm. Bobby R. Inman, USN (Retired), President and Chief Executive Officer, Microelectronics and Computer Technology Corporation; Jeneffir D. Isbister, Head, Environmental Microbiology Section, Atlantic Research Corporation; James Meadlock, President and Chairman, Integrator Corporation; Allen J. Neuhauser, Chairman and Chief Executive Officer, Gannett Company, Inc.; John C. Norman, Thoracic and Cardiovascular Surgeon, Newark Beth Israel Medical Center; Eberhardt Rechtin, President, Aerospace Corporation; Joshua A. Smith, President and Chief Executive Officer, MAXIMA Corporation; Lieu Smith, Vice President and Project Manager, Sverdrup and Parcel and Associates; Association of Science-Technology Centers; and *High Technology Magazine*.

This year's public sector awards went to Sen. Ernest F. Hollings (D-SC); Sen. Jake Garn (R-UT); and Rep. Manuel Lujan, Jr. (D-NM). A special surprise award was presented to Rep. Mervyn M. Dymally (D-CA), Co-Chairman of the Congressional Caucus for Science and Technology, for his tireless efforts to promote leadership in science and technology.

Certificates for Honorable Mention were presented to: Business People, Inc., for pioneering career development techniques via satellite; the Engineers of Bell Communications Research for communications technology; Ms. Daisy C. Hicks for promoting public understanding of technology; Dr. C. Walton Lillehei, for bio-medical technology and Mr. Jean Muller for systems engineering.

The States of Georgia, Minnesota and North Carolina received awards for implementing outstanding programs and activities during National High Tech Week of 1984. Special Appreciation awards were presented to Dr. Alvin Nashman, Coby Smith and William Gary.

Those presenting awards this year include Senators Jay Rockefeller and Jeremiah Denton, and Representatives Norman Mineta and Parren Mitchell. Presenting from the private sector were Dr. Alvin Nashman of the Computer Sciences Corporation and Dr. Walter Massey of the University of Chicago.

## BANKS, TAXES, AND GREED

## HON. FORTNEY H. (PETE) STARK

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 17, 1985

Mr. STARK. Mr. Speaker, the people who gave us billions of dollars in increased deficits by encouraging noncompliance in bank interest and dividend reporting are not well on the way to wrecking tax relief for millions of American taxpayers.

The banking lobby has succeeded in punching a big hole in the tax reform efforts in Ways and Means. Their victory is the Nation's loss.

The following editorial from the Washington Post of October 17, says it all:

## BANKS, TAXES, AND GREED

The arrogance of the banking lobby has to be seen to be believed. As the House Ways and Means Committee was working on President Reagan's tax reform bill this week, the lobbyists succeeded in turning a majority of the members around and, instead of abolishing one particularly dubious tax break for the banks, they actually voted to widen it. It is not as though the commercial banks are overtaxed. To the contrary, banks already pay very little in the way of taxes precisely because of their skill in wedging loopholes into the law.

This one involves the provision that banks make for defaulted loans. Any business can take a deduction for a bad loan. But present law allows banks to set up special reserves—in amounts not necessarily related to their actual losses—and take their deductions when they put money into the reserves rather than when the losses actually take place. As the White House pointed out last spring, this obscure little rule means that banks enjoy more favorable tax treatment of bad debts than other businesses that lend to their customers—department stores, for example. The banks like it that way.

This fragment of tax law may seem esoteric to the point of invisibility, but it means a very substantial amount of money to the banks—\$2.9 billion over the next three years. The president's tax bill would abolish this special preference and put the banks on the same footing as other businesses. The parallel bill put forward by the chairman of Ways and Means, Rep. DAN ROSTENKOWSKI, would do the same thing. But when it came up last Tuesday for a decision, the committee, over Mr. Rostenkowski's vehement protests, voted not only to preserve the present tax break for the bankers but also to expand it by an additional \$4.7 billion over the next three years.

It's not only an example of greed on the part of the banks. It's also a bad omen for tax reform. The president's plan is to reduce tax rates without losing revenue by abolishing expensive loopholes such as this one. You don't have to be told that the people who currently enjoy these preferences are going to fight to keep them. This week they seem to be winning.

## DISCUSSION NEEDED ON DISASTER INSURANCE

## HON. RICHARD A. GEPHARDT

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 17, 1985

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Speaker, the devastating and tragic earthquake that hit Mexico City recently has understandably occupied the hearts and minds of all Americans. We simply cannot be anything but deeply saddened by the loss of thousands of lives—parents and children, brothers and sisters. We all pray for these lost loved ones and those who grieve for them.

The tragedy in Mexico City must also serve as a vivid demonstration of the widespread destruction and enormous costs—both human and financial—that such a natural disaster can bring about at any place on this planet. The downtown area of Mexico City has largely been reduced to rubble, with thousands of deaths and injuries, massive property damage, and Mexico's already troubled economy dealt a further blow. Thousands of residences, shops, and offices in the central city were completely destroyed, creating costs the New York Times called "astronomical."

A tragedy of the magnitude of the Mexico City earthquake raises serious questions for us here in the United States. It is a time to remind ourselves that a natural disaster of this magnitude is certain to affect our own country. The question is not whether it will happen, but when and where.

I am particularly concerned because the New Madrid fault, considered by many seismologists to be a very likely site of the next major earthquake in the United States, is located in my home State of Missouri. Seismologists believe that a truly devastating earthquake well could occur in the Midwest along the New Madrid fault, causing billions of dollars of damage in Missouri, Illinois, Indiana, Kentucky, Tennessee, Mississippi, and Arkansas. There is also, of course, the very real and serious risk of a major earth movement catastrophe in the great State of California.

This past September, Tampa suffered heavy damage from hurricane Elena. And more recently, we here in the Washington area breathed a sigh of relief when hurricane Gloria spared us the destruction we feared. Every year we read of houses on the coast of California sliding into the sea, overwhelmed by the ever-recurring mud. Natural disasters wreak their havoc regularly in our country, and no one knows how long we will be spared the catastrophe the seismologists predict.

What have we done to prepare ourselves for such a natural catastrophe? Little, I submit, if anything. If a disaster of the magnitude of the recent earthquake in Mexico City were to strike a major American metropolitan area tomorrow, many individuals and businesses could suffer life-shattering financial losses. At present, little insurance coverage is available to protect against such catastrophes because of the



sheer magnitude of the risk involved. Currently, if such a disaster should strike, literally billions of dollars of uninsured property damage would result, placing a heavy burden on the Federal Government to provide disaster relief at levels that could only be described as crippling.

It is essential for us to begin to explore solutions to this problem now—before a major disaster strikes. I don't know what the solution is; I'm not sure that anyone does, yet. But clearly it is time to start working toward one now. If we delay in preparing for such a disaster, we too will face the predicament that Mexico City currently faces—a city in ruins without the resources to rebuild.

## I AM NOT THE PRESIDENT, CONTINUED

HON. PATRICIA SCHROEDER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 17, 1985

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Speaker, the Wall Street Journal today details yet another intelligence fiasco—the hiring, training, firing, and defection to the Soviet Union of one Edward L. Howard.

The President of the United States, one Ronald Reagan, has been quick to blame past Presidents for the errors, catastrophes, tragedies, fiascos, and bungling of the current administration.

The entire Howard debacle occurred between 1981 and 1985. Which President shall we blame?—Van Buren? Garfield? Pierce? I await word from the White House.

The Journal article, "KGB Defector Confirms U.S. Intelligence Fiasco," follows:

[From the Wall Street Journal, Oct. 17, 1985]

### KGB DEFECTOR CONFIRMS U.S. INTELLIGENCE FIASCO

(By William Kucewicz)

The KGB took the unusual step last month of issuing what can only be called a press release. In a statement distributed by the official TASS news agency, the Soviet intelligence agency accused a Soviet citizen of spying for the U.S. and also announced the expulsion of a U.S. Embassy official.

The KGB named the suspected spy as A. G. Tolkachev. He was identified merely as a staff member of a "Moscow research institute." No other details about his background were provided. His arrest apparently took place sometime in early June. The announcement maintained that Mr. Tolkachev had been caught passing information to an American diplomat, Paul M. Stombaugh, of the U.S. Embassy's political section. Mr. Stombaugh was ordered to leave the Soviet Union June 14. The KGB statement gave no explanation for the three-month delay in announcing Mr. Tolkachev's arrest and Mr. Stombaugh's expulsion.

Western news correspondents in Moscow interpreted the belated announcement as one-upmanship by Soviet authorities. A week earlier, Britain had expelled 31 Soviets for spying and the Soviet Union responded in kind by ousting an equal number of Britons in Moscow. This exchange had been triggered by the defection of a Soviet spy in

London, who had apparently worked as a double agent for the British for years. The Tolkachev announcement was seen as just another spy maneuver.

### VALUABLE HUMAN ASSET

That wasn't the real story, however. According to high-level U.S. intelligence sources, Mr. Tolkachev was one of the Central Intelligence Agency's most valuable assets in the Soviet Union. And his exposure and arrest stand as indictments of gross mismanagement and ineptitude reaching to the highest levels of U.S. counterintelligence operations.

Mr. Tolkachev was an electronics expert at a military aviation institute in Moscow. Over several years, he had passed invaluable information to the U.S. about the Soviet Union's latest research efforts in new aircraft technology—especially avionics, or electronic guidance and countermeasures; advanced radar; and so-called "stealth," or radar-avoidance, techniques. Such research is at the cutting edge of military aircraft breakthroughs, both for the Soviets and the U.S. Mr. Tolkachev, one source hinted, may have also tipped the U.S. off to the large phased-array radar at Krasnoyarsk—a treaty-violating facility in the south-central part of the country aimed at completing a nationwide anti-ballistic-missile defense.

"He was one of our most lucrative agents," said another well-placed source. "He saved us billions of dollars in development costs" by telling the U.S. about the direction of Soviet aviation efforts. In that way, American researchers could more precisely target their own work toward countering future military threats.

U.S. intelligence experts believe that Mr. Tolkachev is fated for execution, if he is not already dead. But how was he discovered? And why did the KGB wait three months before announcing his arrest?

Mr. Tolkachev wasn't merely caught in the act of passing secrets to the U.S. Embassy's Mr. Stombaugh, as the KGB claims. In fact, as U.S. intelligence sources tell it, he was betrayed by a former CIA agent, Edward L. Howard. And the KGB's peculiar September announcement was apparently a ruse to try to put U.S. counter-intelligence officers off the scent of this turncoat.

Mr. Howard, who is now 33, joined the CIA in January 1981. An initial polygraph test indicated that he was an occasional drug user. Agency officials told him to end his drug-taking or face dismissal. He then promised to give up drugs.

Shortly thereafter, he entered an intensive, 2½-year training program to become a "deep cover" case officer in the U.S. Embassy in Moscow. One of his assignments would be to "run" Mr. Tolkachev; in other words, he was to collect Mr. Tolkachev's materials at "dead drop" sites in Moscow and to care for his needs. In the course of his training, this untried and untested trainee was, inexcusably, told about critical U.S. human intelligence operations in Moscow; he was even informed about anti-Soviet operations in the U.S. Mr. Howard was also trained for several months by the Federal Bureau of Investigation in surveillance techniques and evasion.

Before being dispatched to Moscow, Mr. Howard was given another polygraph test which suggested that his drug use had continued and also indicated at least one instance of petty theft outside the government. According to sources who have long been critical of shortcomings in U.S. counterintelligence capability, Deputy Director of Central Intelligence John N. McMahon

at this point decided he wanted Mr. Howard out of the agency. Mr. McMahon, a career intelligence officer for more than 30 years, had been the CIA's executive director, responsible for the day-to-day management of the agency, when Mr. Howard was hired. In April 1982, Mr. McMahon was named by President Reagan to replace Adm. Bobby R. Inman as deputy intelligence director.

In spring 1983, Mr. Howard was told to resign or he'd be fired. Mr. McMahon took this step despite Mr. Howard's privileged knowledge of U.S. intelligence operations in Moscow, and what his continued drug use said about his emotional stability. (Later, in February 1984, Mr. Howard was arrested for brandishing a pistol at three men in downtown Santa Fe, N.M.; in a plea bargain, he pleaded guilty to an assault charge and was sentenced to probation.) Instead of firing him, intelligence experts suggest, a more sensible course might have been to cancel Mr. Howard's transfer to Moscow but retain him in a nonsensitive area of the agency where his actions could be closely monitored.

(Mr. McMahon didn't return a phone call yesterday requesting comment.)

In September 1984, Mr. Howard told two of his former colleagues at the CIA that he was thinking of passing his information to the Soviets as an act of revenge, according to documents filed in a Justice Department criminal complaint against him. These agents then told the proper CIA authorities about Mr. Howard's threat. But the agency's only response was to get a psychiatrist for Mr. Howard in New Mexico, where the CIA had helped him find a job as an economic analyst with the state government back in June 1983.

Meanwhile, a momentous event was occurring a continent away that would darken further the profile of Edward Howard. On July 28 of this year, in Rome, a visiting Soviet official was taking a stroll with some colleagues. He told them that he would meet them back at the embassy after he toured the Vatican museum. His Soviet compatriots never saw him again, and a month later he was in the U.S. being debriefed by the CIA. The Soviet official is Vitaly Yurchenko of the KGB. By many accounts, he is one of the most important Soviet defectors in recent history.

The State Department officially announced Mr. Yurchenko's defection last week. He was deputy chief of the North American department of the KGB's First Chief Directorate, which is in charge of the Soviet Union's world-wide spy operations. He was "specifically responsible for the direction of KGB intelligence operations in the U.S. and Canada," the State Department's announcement said. In addition, he held a senior position in the KGB's counter-intelligence program, which aims to root out any Russian moles working for the U.S. or other foreign governments. Previously, Mr. Yurchenko served as a spy in the Soviet Embassy in Washington from 1975 to 1980. As a result of these positions, Mr. Yurchenko was able to gain a broad understanding of the highly compartmentalized operations of the KGB.

Mr. Yurchenko gave his debriefers a code name for a former CIA agent who had supplied valuable information to the KGB. While he did not have the real name of the agent, Mr. Yurchenko did provide enough information for U.S. authorities to "sift through" the relevant data and finally pinpoint Mr. Howard as the suspected spy, said law-enforcement sources, who asked not to

be identified. According to other sources familiar with the debriefing, Mr. Yurchenko said that this former CIA agent had provided the KGB with details about U.S. human intelligence activities in Moscow, including the identity of A.G. Tolkachev, Mr. Howard's revelations therefore, prompted Mr. Tolkachev's arrest and likely execution.

#### MAJOR FOUL-UP

FBI agents were instructed to interview Mr. Howard but not to arrest him. Explained a law-enforcement source: "The information provided by the defector, standing alone, was not sufficient to establish probable cause." After he was quizzed, FBI agents kept Mr. Howard under surveillance. In a major foul-up, however, no one ever told the FBI agents that Mr. Howard had been schooled by the bureau itself in surveillance and evasion tactics.

On the moonless night of Sept. 21, Mr. Howard escaped his FBI watchdogs. On Sept. 23, the FBI issued a warrant for his arrest, but it was too late. U.S. intelligence finally succeeded in tracing Mr. Howard's trail to Finland and then to Moscow, where he is now presumably being debriefed on all he knows about U.S. spying operations in the Soviet Union and elsewhere.

"The United States has virtually zero counterintelligence capability," Sen. Malcolm Wallop (R., Wyo.) said recently in criticizing the CIA's and FBI's failures in the Howard case. Some experts are predicting a major shakeup in intelligence management due to the Howard-Tolkachev-Yurchenko affair. What will remain after blame is assessed, of course, is that the U.S. has lost one of its most valuable human assets in the Soviet Union and his alleged betrayer has fled safely to Moscow.

#### ARNOLD ROPEIK SPEAKS OUT ON THE WALLENBERG CASE

#### HON. JIM COURTER

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 17, 1985

Mr. COURTER. Mr. Speaker, this morning's news reports include mention of a U.S. district court ruling that the Soviet Union violated international law in 1945 when it seized Swedish diplomat Raoul Wallenberg, credited with saving some 100,000 Hungarian Jews. Andrei Gromyko, the current Soviet President, admitted in 1957 that Mr. Wallenberg was in fact a Soviet prisoner, but stated that he died of natural causes on July 17, 1947. However the U.S. court found "credible and uncontroverted evidence" that Wallenberg was alive long after 1947.

Perhaps the Soviets who speak so regularly of the evils of Nazism and their own wartime efforts to protect mankind from those evils, will never do anything to help us resolve this terrible mystery. But we cannot afford to forget the dangerous sacrifices made by Mr. Wallenberg, or all those now living in this country whose freedom and safe passage he won.

Arnold Ropeik, managing editor of the Times of Trenton, NJ, wrote a fine column on the Wallenberg case a few weeks ago, and its message is worthy of a wide hearing. I ask that it be entered into the RECORD for today.

#### The article follows:

[From the Times (Trenton, NJ), Sept. 27, 1985]

#### WALLENBERG: CAN'T HE BE SAVED?

(By Arnold Ropeik)

Most people are now pretty familiar with the Raoul Wallenberg story. His exploits are legendary, and when you talk about genuine heroes, this man is surely one of them.

From time to time, individuals or groups hold programs designed to draw support in the fight to find out what really happened to Wallenberg. But what baffles me is why it remains for small groups, individuals and the media to illuminate the facts when that illumination should come from the most powerful offices in the world.

Research shows that some efforts have been made. By the United States; by Sweden, his native land; by major Jewish and non-Jewish human rights groups. All want to save a man who, by bravery, bluff and brilliance, kept Nazi death squads at bay and saved something like 100,000 people from certain doom.

It is obvious that not enough was done early on. The matter lay hidden, or at best, forgotten, for much too long.

Wallenberg will be honored at a reception, dinner and program beginning at 5:30 p.m. Oct. 5 in Scanticon-Princeton Conference Center.

Why is this man allowed to rot in prison, Russian or wherever?

Why didn't his native Sweden scream long, loud and much earlier to the rest of the world?

Why can't the all-powerful United States extract an answer from the Soviet Union to at least one element of the drama: Is he alive or is he dead?

Why was he imprisoned by the Russians at the end of the war if what he did victimized the hated Nazis, the same demented murderers who raped the Russian land and its people?

When a man saves 100,000 people, he leaves an indelible mark on many communities, and this area is one of them. In the last days of the war, one of Wallenberg's cleverly devised and courageously presented documents saved the lives of Dr. Vera Goodkin and her family. She is a professor at Mercer County Community College who will be at the Oct. 5 tribute to tell the story of her rescue.

Per Anger, a retired Swedish diplomat, will fly in from Sweden to offer firsthand description of those dramatic days in Budapest. Anger was one of those who worked alongside Wallenberg in preparing diplomatic "passes" that fooled the Nazis.

Anger, who worked with Wallenberg in the tense days of 1944-45, may be able to shed some light on Wallenberg's fate. He has remained in touch with the situation especially after Wallenberg was believed sighted a few years ago in a Russian prison.

The Oct. 5 date has added significance. It is the fourth anniversary of the day Congress made Wallenberg an honorary citizen of the U.S.

To me, the knowledge that he is a citizen of this land, honorary or real, should force our government to keep the heat on and cry out loudly in Wallenberg's behalf.

What possible motive can the Russians have for keeping this man behind bars? Did Wallenberg come by information the Soviets cannot afford to have the world know? Was he involved in espionage for Sweden, or others?

When American hostages are taken around the world, the hue and cry reverber-

ates throughout the planet. This man is now one of us. We ought to fight harder to find out what has happened to him.

The small session at Scanticon is but one tiny chapter in this astounding story. Perhaps an answer or two will come from the gathering. Maybe an idea on how to proceed will be born.

The story, and the man himself, must not be allowed to perish.

If Raoul Wallenberg dies alone, we all will carry some of burden of his death.

#### BUSINESS SUPPORTS DAYLIGHT SAVING TIME

#### HON. EDWARD J. MARKEY

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 17, 1985

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. Speaker, the House is scheduled on Tuesday to consider H.R. 2095, the Daylight Saving Extension Act of 1985. This legislation, which adds 3 weeks of daylight saving time at the start, and 1 week at the end, has been supported by every President over the past 15 years, because of its benefits for energy conservation, crime reduction, and traffic safety.

Daylight saving time has also enjoyed tremendous public support. Recent public opinion polls show that Americans would prefer more daylight saving time by more than 2 to 1.

This year, businesses have also recognized the benefits of daylight saving time and have joined forces in the Daylight Saving Time Coalition. The Coalition represents businesses with over \$135 billion in annual sales. These companies have estimated that sales could increase by 5 to 10 percent from increased daylight saving time. That \$6 to \$13 billion increase means more jobs, economic growth, and lower deficits.

The members of the Daylight Saving Time Coalition are:

Amateur Softball Association; American Association of Nursery; Barbeque Industry Association, Chocolate Manufacturers Association; Foodservice and Lodging Institute; Hechinger Co.; International Association of Amusement Parks & Attractions; The Kingsford Co.

National Association of Convenience Stores; National Candy Brokers Association; National Confectioners Association; Parcourse; RP Foundation Fighting Blindness; The Southland Corp.; Sporting Goods Manufacturers Association.

Extending daylight saving time is a way to boost the economy without tax breaks or Government spending. In fact, the increased economic activity will help reduce our deficit.

I urge my colleagues to support this bill.



**ROBOTICS AND AUTOMATION  
AT ROCKWELL INTERNATIONAL CORP.**

**HON. DOUG WALGREN**

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 17, 1985

Mr. WALGREN. Mr. Speaker, on October 7, the House Subcommittee on Science, Research and Technology, which I chair, held a hearing on the role of automation and robotics in U.S. competitiveness. The hearing took place at the College of Technology of the State University of New York in Utica, where new research and training programs have been initiated in these rapidly moving technical fields.

As my colleagues know, U.S. industrial competitiveness is threatened by obsolescence in parts of our basic and manufacturing industries. Innovations in robotics and automation technology hold the promise for dramatically improving productivity and thereby, regaining our strong position in international trade. Government, industry, and academia must continue their cooperative efforts to bring these technologies on-line and to train the work force that will be required.

I was particularly pleased that one of the participants in the hearing was from Rockwell International Corp., with headquarters in Pittsburgh. Mr. J. David Mitchell, Rockwell's director for productivity and advanced manufacturing programs presented the subcommittee with a description of the impressive progress at Rockwell in robotics and automation. I would like to share Mr. Mitchell's statement with my colleagues. It was an excellent contribution to our hearing.

STATEMENT OF J. DAVID MITCHELL, DIRECTOR-PRODUCTIVITY AND ADVANCED MANUFACTURING PROGRAMS, ROCKWELL INTERNATIONAL CORP., CONCERNING ROBOTICS AND AUTOMATION

Mr. Chairman and members of the subcommittee, I am J. David Mitchell, Director—Productivity and Advanced Manufacturing Programs, on the corporate operations staff of Rockwell International Corporation.

I am pleased to have this opportunity to tell you about the progress we are making at Rockwell in robotics and automation.

First, let me give you some idea of the scope of the company.

We expect our 1985 sales to be in excess of 11 billion dollars.

We have more than 120,000 employees. And a high percentage of them are engineers or hold other advanced technical degrees.

We have 5 major business operations and, under them, more than 40 divisions and other smaller business units.

Our products include NASA's Space Shuttle orbiter, the B-1B aircraft, marine navigation systems, telecommunications, avionics, printing presses, truck axles and brakes, valves—meters and light vehicle components. Earlier this year we acquired Allen-Bradley, a leading manufacturer of industrial automation equipment and systems.

We operate in 285 locations on six continents.

Certainly, the drive for improved productivity and quality are not new for Rockwell, or American industry. We all have been trying for years to get greater productivity and quality.

Over the past several years, we have evolved at Rockwell a structured and disciplined methodology to insure that productivity and quality are integral parts of our business strategies.

Automation and modernization have been one of these key strategies and we appreciate this opportunity to share with you a few of our activities in automation because we believe this is one route by which U.S. industry can enhance its competitive position worldwide.

All of us recognize the strong contribution that capital makes to this improvement process and we have been investing aggressively for major programs, new products, and especially for productivity and quality improvements.

We have spent over 3 billion dollars on new facilities, equipment and systems since 1980—and we estimate that about 66 percent of all these expenditures fall into the categories of cost reduction, automation and modernization.

Here are some areas of investment that deserve special mention.

For instance, we have moved aggressively in the development and implementation of CAD/CAM technology and have spent well over 200 million dollars for capital equipment throughout the company. Our investment in software development that is unique to our individual businesses is significantly higher than that.

CAD/CAM currently is being used by more than 95 percent of our operating divisions throughout the world—with very good results.

In one case, major aircraft frame components were designed on a CAD system as full three-dimensional components. A frame was later selected to be converted to a forging by an outside vendor.

The 3-D database was electronically transmitted from Rockwell to the vendor where they were able to create the forging design, without drawings, directly from the 3-D database—at significant savings in time and cost.

Rockwell is investing almost 500 million dollars every year in computer hardware/software, office automation, local area networks and telecommunications to support engineering, manufacturing and information system technology areas.

We have also added a Cray super computer to our scientific computing resources in the last year. This 10-million-dollar computer will permit more effective payload, structural and thermal analysis on Space Shuttle, Space Station and B-1B, to name a few applications.

These investments have resulted in the ability to improve both our product design as well as our manufacturing processes. We are also involved in a number of modernization projects across many of our government businesses.

We are a firm believer in joint government/industry programs that provide modernization incentives and we are experiencing the advantages to be gained through them.

As an example Rockwell has invested about 100 million dollars in a major facility at Palmdale, California, for final assembly and checkout of the B-1B's.

An important feature of this complex is a computerized checkout facility for the aircraft.

Four completed aircraft can be accommodated at one time, and up to 10 systems can be checked simultaneously.

The result is that B-1B systems can be checked out in about 4 weeks—which compares with about 4 months using traditional methods.

Here are examples of some other programs.

Within our Defense Electronics Business we have recently completed a state-of-the-art Gallium Arsenide ( $GaAs$ ) facility in Newbury Park, California, for pilot production of very large scale integrated circuits under a DARPA contract. Rockwell has invested 14 million dollars in a facility which will manufacture the next generation, low-power, radiation-hardened chips that are capable of operating 5-to-10 times faster than current technology.

Our Rocketdyne Division is currently working with NASA under a 10 million-dollar development program for advanced TIG welding using robotics. Rockwell is investing an additional 5 million-dollars for equipment. The program uses advanced sensors for weld penetration and seam tracking and interactive graphics for off-line robotics programming. This welding modernization program will reduce costs and improve quality on Space Shuttle main engines and components.

At Autonetics Strategic Systems Division we have developed high-precision robots to clean high tolerance gyro components for inertial guidance systems. These five-axis units cut time from 4.5 hours to 14 minutes, an improvement factor of 19. At the same time they also made a significant improvement in quality.

We have experienced strong growth in the application of robotics in all our businesses.

We have gone from less than 10 units in 1979 to more than 150 units estimated for the fiscal year which just started.

Most of our applications are in the more traditional machine loading and unloading and material handling areas with approximately 70 percent of our robots being used for these applications.

A very good example of flexible automation at work is the "factory-in-a-factory" built by our Allen-Bradley subsidiary in Milwaukee, Wisconsin.

This completely automated facility produces a world design motor starter line of products and that in itself is an interesting story of global competition.

Briefly, foreign starter manufacturers were beginning to sell into the U.S. market with a lower priced product. Allen-Bradley's response was a strategic investment of about 15 million dollars to design an automation showcase and enter the market with a world product that could be sold competitively in all markets.

The plant capacity is 600 starters per hour. They come in two sizes and 125 variations and may be produced singly or in batches in any combinations.

Production is driven by orders entered on terminals at Allen-Bradley distributors worldwide and sent directly to a mainframe computer in Milwaukee.

Starting with raw material such as plastic molding compound and metal stock, the plant makes just the number of controllers in the specific mix to meet that day's orders.

Orders received are shipped the following day and the necessary invoices are created as part of the shipping process.

And, although it's fashionable to talk about advanced manufacturing concepts

and automation technology, in some cases we've also realized some pretty impressive productivity improvements with modest investments.

In many of our factories, we've simply rearranged our existing equipment and machinery to take full advantage of cellular manufacturing opportunities.

With cellular manufacturing and improved production control systems, we've seen direct labor reduced by 50 to 60 percent . . .

Production rates increased by 100 percent . . .

Set-up time cut by 30 to 70 percent . . .

Fork lift moves cut by 75 percent . . .

Inventory turns doubled . . .

And we've seen enormous improvements in throughput.

In a typical example one of our manufactured parts used to be in process for 54 days, shuttling around from one department to another.

With cellular manufacturing, the whole process now can be accomplished in as little as 6 days.

We currently have over 175 manufacturing cells in our company.

In many of these manufacturing cells we've added robots for additional flexibility.

We recently brought on line, at one of our mid-western plants, a cell that turns out small iron valves. This cell produces one completely machined valve body every 26 seconds.

When we add a duplicate set of processes to the cell, it will produce a valve body every 15 seconds—the most efficient production in the world for this type of valve.

Automation accomplishes many things: it improves flexibility, provides the opportunity to rapidly respond to changing market demands, increases quality, and provides a lower overall cost base.

At the same time it brings about a shift in the technical skill level requirements for all employees.

At the operator and process level there is a distinct need for broader multi-disciplined skills.

We are providing specialized training for literally thousands of our people and we are now in the process of refining and shaping the focus of our training techniques.

As an example, over 10,000 of our people have been trained in statistical process control techniques and these process control methods are being used by more than 70 of our plants.

We have learned that our automation and modernization efforts can only be successful through people initiatives, and we know that people make the greatest contributions to improved quality and performance when they are involved in the process.

Many companies have been very successful in moving toward more worker participation in decision making at the plant level.

At Rockwell we have several plants where we have planned for the integration of people and technical systems long before the plants were built.

These plants, located in both the U.S. and Great Britain, had their specific operating procedures and employee practices literally designed by employee teams.

This cooperation that lead to the successful new plant design process has continued in day-to-day operation, resulting in factories that are not only productive but are great places to work.

These plants have achieved greater production levels, very high quality, and an extremely low level of absenteeism and employee turnover.

Even though these plants are highly automated they have some additional ingredients—such as an all salaried workforce, fewer levels of management, simplified job classification structure, and group incentive programs.

As we continue to automate our factories, we have not lost sight of the fact that we must do a better job in the professional and white collar areas.

We are focusing considerable resources on this aspect of the business, just as we have done on the shop floor.

In conclusion, broader work skills among all our employees require significantly broader levels of education and training. These new levels of automation mandate a more cohesive relationship between employees, machines and technology. Education and training programs must consider the new integrated socio-technical environment.

#### OPPOSITION TO "FLAWED" EQUITABLE PAY BILL

HON. CARROLL HUBBARD, JR.

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 17, 1985

Mr. HUBBARD. Mr. Speaker, recently the House passed H.R. 3008, the Federal Equitable Pay Practices Act, legislation about which I was contacted by many of my constituents and other Kentuckians across the State.

I would like to share with my colleagues the letter I received from my fellow Kentuckian, James E. Davis, vice president and manager of employee relations, of Wayne Supply Co. in Louisville, KY. Jim Davis' comments regarding the flawed H.R. 3008 should be interesting to my colleagues, particularly his views about equal pay for equal work and his concern that the legislation is a step toward supplanting traditional market forces in the private sector.

The letter to me from Jim Davis follows:

WAYNE SUPPLY CO.,

Louisville, KY, August 30, 1985.

Hon. CARROLL HUBBARD, JR.,  
Rayburn House Office Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN HUBBARD: We urge you to vote "No" on H.R. 3008, "The Federal Equitable Pay Practices Act," when it comes to the floor in September. This is a flawed bill because the concept on which it is based is erroneous. This legislation is much more than a mere study of the federal work force to determine if discrimination exists. It endorses the controversial and ill-conceived idea of comparable worth. Such a move will undoubtedly be the first step toward imposing comparable worth on the private sector.

Certainly men and women performing the same job should be paid the same wages. The Equal Pay Act mandates equal pay for equal work. And Title VII of the Civil Rights Act prohibits discrimination against minorities or women in hiring, promotion, pay and training. Wages should be determined by the market economy thereby reflecting the free will of individuals moving freely between job opportunities.

Comparable worth, however, goes far beyond the current law. It is based on a theory of equality of occupations—a concept rejected by all but one lower court in this country. Supply and demand remains a pri-

mary factor for setting wages within the private sector. Comparable worth rejects supply and demand as a valid method of setting salaries, and replaces it with someone's concept of intrinsic worth of occupations.

H.R. 3008 sets up a super-agency, "The Pay Equity Commission," comprised of 11 political appointees to select a job evaluator to review both the blue and white collar jobs in the federal government. Any unexplained differences in pay between jobs which are determined by the consultant to be "equivalent in totality" will be reviewed by the Commission. The Commission, who has no expertise in the civil rights area, will then decide how much of the wage gap is the result of discrimination. This is comparable worth. It is a bad idea, which would be totally unworkable in the private sector. In the public sector, it will result in salary increases and will do nothing to eradicate discrimination. I urge you to vote no on this legislation.

Sincerely,

JAMES E. DAVIS,  
Vice President,  
Manager, Employee Relations.

#### MARK CHECCHIO HONORED BY NAVY

HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 17, 1985

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, I am very honored today to call attention to Lt. Comdr. Mark Checchio, who has been given a commendation by the U.S. Department of the Navy. I have known Mark and his family for many, many years, and it is with great pride that I insert the following letter in the RECORD. It is from his commanding officer, and it details the reasons why Mark Checchio is so deserving of the Navy's "Topcat of the Year" award.

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY,

FIGHTER SQUADRON FIFTY-ONE,

San Francisco, August 14, 1985.

From: Commanding Officer, Fighter Squadron Fifty-one.

To: Commander Fighter Airborne Early Warning Wing, U.S. Pacific Fleet.  
Subject: Topcat of the Year Award.

1. In accordance with reference (a), Fighter Squadron Fifty-one proudly nominates Lieutenant Commander Mark Checchio for the 1985 "Topcat" award. His superior performance in the fighter community during the past year should rank him "top choice" among those competing for this award.

2. LCDR Checchio is a "superstar" whose individual achievements during the past year, both on the ground and in the cockpit, make him uniquely eligible for this prestigious award. His business is carrier based anti-air warfare, and he is a master at it. Mark is serving on his first tour as an F-14 pilot following pilot transition training. Prior to that, he served as a RIO in F-4's and F-14's and as an instructor RIO at Navy Fighter Weapons School (Topgun).

3. During the squadron's recently completed Western Pacific and Indian Ocean deployment aboard U.S.S. *Carl Vinson*, Mark established himself as the acknowledged AAW expert in both the squadron and the Battle Group. Due to his extensive operational background, he was selected to head



this squadron's revolutionary AAW department. Every success enjoyed during the deployment in the AAW arena resulted directly from Mark's efforts. Specifically, he:

Exhaustively researched and personally authored a detailed secret report on Soviet Anti-Carrier Warfare tactics used in the regimental sized simulated attack made against the multi-carrier battle group on the night of 2 December 1984. Both the report and, more significantly, Mark's superb briefings on the same strike have received widest possible dissemination, including Flag level. VADM McCarthy, COMSEVENTHFLT, personally used this report to brief CINCPACFLT, CNO and Navy War College.

Marrying the long-standing "Vector Logic" AAW tactics (which Mark helped develop six years ago) and the newly developed "Chainsaw" Long Range Intercept tactics, Mark authored a major CVW-15 AAW Tacpro, which was so detailed and readable, that even new aircrews not familiar with AAW procedures easily learned the tactics.

Mark organized, planned, briefed and executed the first Pacific Fleet "Chainsaw" exercise which enabled Air Wing Fifteen F-14's to launch from the U.S.S. *Carl Vinson* and successfully intercept simulated Soviet long range Bombers (USAF B-52's) in excess of 500 NM from the Battle Group.

4. Mark's numerous contributions to the defense posture of Battle Group Charlie reached a pinnacle on 3 December 1984, during flight operations in the Sea of Japan. Soviet reaction to the dual CVBG presence had been moderate to heavy but confined to long range aircraft only and had not included tactical armed threats. LCDR Mark Checchio launched in an F-14 and assumed a combat air patrol position between the carriers and Soviet homeland only 80 miles away. After about forty-five minutes he received a vector to investigate two armed, Soviet Mig-23 Floggers rapidly approaching the outer edge of the Asian Eastern Buffer Zone.

LCDR Checchio immediately turned his aircraft toward the intruders and gained rapid, radar acquisition and visual sight of the approaching aircraft smoke trails but realized he was rapidly approaching the buffer zone. Sensitive to the international implications of violating Russian airspace, yet fully conscious of the dangerous threat that two armed Soviet tactical airplanes presented to him, LCDR Checchio sacrificed the radar advantage and reversed course to draw the two Russian pilots well into international airspace, all the while maintaining visual sight of the threat.

Once the two Soviet airplanes were well into international airspace, LCDR Checchio rapidly reversed course into the threat. Starting from a neutral head-on aspect and taking less than a minute, he skillfully maneuvered his airplane to an advantageous, dead six o'clock position on both aircraft which provided him ample opportunity to record both Mig-23's armed with Apex and Aphid air-to-air missiles on videotape and precluded the Soviet pilots from gaining weapons firing parameters (enclosure 3). The two Soviet airplanes immediately turned and ran towards the safety of their own airspace and LCDR Checchio returned to station.

Fifteen minutes later, an armed Soviet SU-15 Flagon raced outside the buffer towards LCDR Checchio. Again, he skillfully maneuvered his aircraft into an advantageous, six o'clock position and captured the Flagon, armed with both IR and radar guided versions of ANAB missiles, on video-

tape while denying the Soviet pilot a weapons firing opportunity (enclosure 4).

Displaying superior tactical forethought and expert airmanship, LCDR Checchio not only prevented an international incident but successfully conducted the first modern day intercept of armed Soviet tactical airplanes and gained valuable tactical information for future exploitation by the various intelligence agencies. In view of the information gained and the discipline exercised during the engagement, LCDR Checchio was awarded the Navy Achievement Medal (enclosure 5).

5. Despite his relatively short career to date in the front seat of the F-14, LCDR Checchio has already earned a well-deserved reputation in the squadron and the Air Wing as a premier fighter pilot and tactician. Mark is a warrior who clearly displayed "The Right Stuff" when it counted. His significant contributions to the fighter community during the past year have had fleet-wide impact. Without a doubt, he is most deserving of recognition as the "Topcat" for 1985.

C.F. ZULLINGER.

## DEMOCRATS AS DUCKPINS

### HON. WILLIAM D. FORD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 17, 1985

Mr. FORD of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, the seeds of the so-called balanced budget amendment sponsored by Senators GRAMM, RUDMAN, and HOLLINGS in the other body are threatening to grow into a major reordering of this Nation's separation of powers. This budget-balancing black box, while achieving eventual parity between spending and revenues, would relegate the U.S. Congress into a reactive institution with a rubberstamp as its most effective club.

This point, and others, was effectively articulated in a recent op-ed piece by David Broder entitled, "Democrats As Duckpins," published in the October 16, 1985, edition of the Washington Post. I insert this excellent opinion for the benefit of my colleagues, Democrats and Republicans alike:

[From the Washington Post, Oct. 16, 1985]

#### DEMOCRATS AS DUCKPINS

(By David S. Broder)

When Sen. Gary Hart (D-Colo.) went on the radio last Saturday to denounce as "a tragedy and a travesty" the Republican-sponsored budget-balancing plan that sailed through the Senate last week, it was billed as the Democratic response to President Reagan.

Actually, Hart spoke for himself and 19 other Senate Democrats who opposed the plan. He did not speak for the 27 Senate Democrats who joined the Republicans in passing it.

Three of the six Democratic senators who have sought the party's presidential nomination, including Edward M. Kennedy of Massachusetts, supported the GOP plan. Three others, including Hart claimed it was "a political fraud," and voted against it.

The chairman of the Democratic Senatorial Campaign Committee, George Mitchell of Maine, opposed it, calling it "irresponsible and unacceptable." The chairman of the

Democratic Congressional Campaign Committee, Tony Coelho of California, while favoring some changes, in arguing to fellow-Democrats that it would be smart politics to let it go into effect.

In short, what has happened is that the Republicans have rolled a political 10-strike with their deficit-cutting plan, and the Democrats are flying in every direction. With a single move, the GOP has taken the deficit issue, which seemed its greatest burden, and deftly shifted the monkey to the Democrats' back.

The substantive effects of the plan on both government programs and on the balance of power between the executive and legislative branches are important enough to merit separate comment. So many questions were left unanswered in the Senate's rush to judgment that it is well the Senate-House conference on the measure will be protracted.

But politically, it is evident already that the late-session initiative by two junior Republican senators, Phil Gramm of Texas and Warren Rudman of New Hampshire, has thrown the Democrats for a loop.

Beyond the obvious political posturing of such potential 1988 rivals as Kennedy and Hart, there was both intellectual confusion and fundamental strategic disagreement among Senate Democrats. Smart southern progressives such as Dale Bumpers of Arkansas and Lawton Chiles of Florida could not agree. Neither could canny conservatives such as Sam Nunn of Georgia and Bennett Johnston of Louisiana. Nor could liberal freshmen such as Paul Simon of Illinois and Tom Harkin of Iowa.

The disarray among House Democrats is, I suspect, going to be even greater, and show even more clearly the basic cleavages inside the old Democratic coalition.

The members of the black caucus and others representing urban and rural districts where government aid is a necessity, not a luxury, have been increasingly restive as the leaders of their party have accepted the philosophy of budget-cutting and avoiding a tax-increase.

They went along reluctantly with those, like Speaker Thomas P. (Tip) O'Neill (D-Mass.), who said Reagan would murder the Democrats politically if they came out for a tax hike, even as they saw aid to their cities and their constituents whittled away.

But this proposal—which requires far deeper cuts and gives the president the power to impose them if Congress does not—has ripped it. Rep. Ron Dellums (D-Calif.), one of those critics, charged that despite the support it drew from people such as Kennedy and Bumpers and Simon, "I see no guarantees (in the proposal) for the poor and powerless. The people that I represent who have been the most loyal supporters of the Democratic Party do not deserve to have their loyalty rewarded by abandonment."

Many white liberals, however, argue that the political imperative to "do something" about the deficit is irresistible, and they think Gramm-Rudman can be reshaped in conference to force Reagan to accept a choice between deep defense cuts and acquiescence in higher taxes.

They voted to go to conference on the measure despite deep misgivings about the proposal as it stands. Rep. John Dingell (D-Mich.) said his preliminary analysis suggests that the transfer of the power of the purse from Congress to the president is so great under the Senate-approved bill that "everything that's been gained (by legislatures in

democratic countries) since the field of Rummymede has been thrown away."

Rep. David Obey (D-Wis.), another liberal conferee, said his hope is that "we can keep all categories of spending on the table, and then the military will have to take a real hit if Reagan refuses to consider a tax increase." But he, too, conceded that "at this point, nobody knows what's in it and what it would really do."

Backstage there are Democratic strategists who don't really care what is in it, or what it does, so long as it is rewritten to take effect in 1986 and so long as the voters know it's basically a Republican design.

House Democratic campaign chief Coelho argued that "when the crunch comes, and programs people want are cut, they will remember who pushed it."

That hope of a public backlash is little consolation to those like Dellums who see Gramm-Rudman as the final step in Reagan's design to dismantle the welfare state. They see betrayal, not shrewdness, in the acquiescence of so many Democrats in that plot.

#### LUPUS AWARENESS WEEK IN WYOMING

#### HON. DICK CHENEY

OF WYOMING

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 17, 1985

Mr. CHENEY. Mr. Speaker, lupus erythematosus is a disease which strikes over 55,000 individuals each year. It victims are primarily young women between the age of 16 and 30. Next week is National Lupus Awareness Week and I would like to take the opportunity to commend the Wyoming Chapter of the American Lupus Society for its work to heighten public awareness of this disease. Following is a proclamation issued by Governor Ed Herschler proclaiming October 20 through October 26 Lupus Awareness Week in Wyoming.

#### PROCLAMATION: LUPUS AWARENESS WEEK

Whereas, there are approximately one million Americans who are victims of lupus and it is estimated that over 55,000 new cases are diagnosed each year. Although not well known, lupus is more prevalent than muscular dystrophy, cerebral palsy, multiple sclerosis, leukemia, cystic fibrosis and other highly visible and better known diseases. Ninety percent of lupus patients are women, with the average age of onset being 16 to 30. It affects all races and lupus strikes one woman in about every 400; and

Whereas, the cause of lupus is not known, and its initial diagnosis is difficult to make since there is no single set of symptoms or pattern to the disease. Lupus is not cancerous or infectious. Recent studies indicate distinct hereditary factors exist; and

Whereas, in recent years, the outlook for lupus patients has improved due to extensive and vigorous research and positive results have emerged from studies uncovering several diverse defects of the immune system and from research on genetic and environmental factors influencing the disease.

Therefore, I, Ed Herschler, Governor of Wyoming, in recognition of the need for greater public awareness of lupus, do hereby proclaim the week of October 20 through October 26, 1985, as "Lupus Awareness Week".

I call upon the people of the State of Wyoming to observe this week with appropriate ceremonies and activities.

In Witness Whereof, I have hereunto set my hand and caused the Great Seal of the State of Wyoming, to be affixed this 27th day of September, 1985.

ED HERSCHLER, Governor.

Attest: Thyra Thomson, Secretary of State.

#### A TRIBUTE TO SISTER MARY DEPAUL GLUNS

#### HON. ALAN WHEAT

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 17, 1985

Mr. WHEAT. Mr. Speaker, for the past 20 years, Sister Mary DePaul Gluns has been a teacher, counselor, and friend to the students at St. Mary's, an Independence high school in my congressional district. On October 23, alumni, parents, friends, and students will say thanks to this remarkable woman at a program in her honor. It is with tremendous pleasure that I am able to add my voice to the chorus of gratitude expressed by her colleagues and many friends.

An outstanding educator, Sister Mary DePaul entered the convent at St. Agnes Academy in Kansas City, MO, in 1927. She has taught thousands of children in eight different schools over the years and her message has always been the same. Sister Mary DePaul instills in her students that regardless of scholastic ability, each student is special. She has the knack to make the less capable student feel as proud as the straight A pupil.

A foreign language specialist, Sister Mary DePaul taught several other classes besides German language and culture. She was at different times a mathematics, English, and social studies teacher. Her breadth of experience may explain why so many beginning teachers turned to her for advice and assistance. Her advice and assistance was especially sought and needed during a time of dramatic upheaval in education in the 1970's.

Mr. Speaker, it would be impossible to show the depth of our gratitude to Sister Mary DePaul on this one occasion. She has meant so much to so many people over the years. Her students have learned more than just words and mathematical equations from her. They have been taught the values espoused by a kind, sincere and devoted educator. Sister Mary DePaul will be missed, but she will not be forgotten. I join with her colleagues, friends, and the parents and students of St. Mary's in expressing our appreciation to Sister Mary DePaul Gluns.

#### COSTA RICA THANKS THE HOUSE FOR SUPPORTING COSTA RICAN NEUTRALITY

#### HON. MICHAEL D. BARNES

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 17, 1985

Mr. BARNES. Mr. Speaker, I have received a copy of a letter to you from President Luis Alberto Monge of Costa Rica, in which he thanks the House for passing House Concurrent Resolution 33 in support of Costa Rican neutrality. I was privileged to be the sponsor of the resolution.

Mr. Speaker, I would respectfully suggest that the House should have the benefit of seeing this expression of thanks from the President of Costa Rica, so I include the letter at this point for the information of our colleagues.

SAN JOSE,

September 27, 1985.

Hon. THOMAS P. O'NEILL, Jr.,  
Speaker of the House, House of Representatives,  
Washington, DC.

DEAR SPEAKER O'NEILL: I would like to express my appreciation to the entire House of Representatives for its fine gesture in the passing of House Resolution 33 supporting Costa Rican Neutrality. Your action gives me much personal comfort as I try to maintain Costa Rica's traditional and rather unique role as an unarmed country dedicated to peace and democracy. It is our deep desire that when these fratricidal wars end, Costa Rica will be able to help heal the wounds of our neighbors. Our policy of permanent active and disarmed neutrality is very important if we are to have an opportunity to fulfill this goal.

Sincerely yours,

LUIS ALBERTO MONGE,  
President, Republic of Costa Rica.

#### WASHINGTON EFFORT STARTED TO HELP VICTIMS OF DISASTER IN PUERTO RICO: WORST IN CENTURY

#### HON. ROBERT GARCIA

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 17, 1985

Mr. GARCIA. Mr. Speaker, the recent disastrous flooding and mud slides in Puerto Rico have claimed the lives of hundreds of our fellow U.S. citizens, and efforts are now underway to aid the victims of this tragic disaster which is the worst of this century to hit the island.

With the Presidential declaration that Puerto Rico is eligible for disaster assistance will come help for the massive effort to meet the housing needs of many who lost their residences, particularly in Ponce, PR. Although help is needed throughout the island in areas suffering severe flooding.

The response to this tragedy by the many Puerto Ricans living on the mainland has been overwhelming. In New York, concern for the victims has resulted in a numerous outpouring of offers to help.



Many Puerto Ricans also live and work in the Washington area, and here, I am gratified to note, all segments of the Puerto Rican community have banded together to set up an ad hoc committee to provide speedy relief and contributions to private, tax-exempt relief organizations set up in Puerto Rico by both the Commonwealth government acting in concert with private industry and also the city of Ponce.

Since the needs are so immense, this ad hoc committee is publicizing the effort throughout the Washington metropolitan area that check contributions can be sent made out to either Unidos de Puerto Rico or the Ponce emergency relief fund, both island-based organizations, and the groups will share equally in contributions. Checks or cash contributions can be sent to ISLA, P.O. Box 6557, Washington, DC 20035.

There are many Puerto Ricans here who work for the Federal Government, and Washington is also headquarters for such prominent and worthwhile groups as the National Puerto Rican Coalition, the National Puerto Rican Forum, and others who have always given so unsparingly of their time and expertise in helping mainland and island Puerto Ricans have a fair share of access to opportunity in our society.

The tragedy in Puerto Rico, its magnitude, and the loss of lives of so many Puerto Ricans, is one which surely merits our attention and help.

A press release issued by the Ad Hoc Washington Committee to Support Puerto Rico Relief Effort follows outlining the various efforts being coordinated to help the victims of the disaster.

WASHINGTON, DC—Puerto Rican individuals and groups in the Washington Metropolitan area and nearby Baltimore have launched a relief effort to help victims of the recent floods and mud slides in the Island which may have recently claimed more than 500 lives.

Members of the Puerto Rican community here have set up an informal ad hoc committee to expedite the collection of contributions to two Island-based non-profit, tax exempt funds established after the disaster in Puerto Rico.

The first, Unidos de Puerto Rico, was set up by the Commonwealth government working with private industry. The second, the Ponce Emergency Relief Fund, was organized by the City of Ponce, located on the south coast where the majority of the deaths occurred in an area called Barrio Mayeyes.

The informal volunteer effort was organized last Wednesday and is seeking to publicize the fact that checks can be sent directly to a local box number, according to Puerto Rican lawyer, Ms. Emma Navajas. Checks made out to either Unidos de Puerto Rico or the Ponce Emergency Relief Funds can be sent c/o ISLA, P.O. Box 65557, Washington, D.C. 20035. Isla is a Washington consulting firm headed by Ms. Paquita Vivo.

A total of 26 individuals representing Puerto Rico's government agencies and civic groups met last Friday in order to mount an immediate joint effort to aid victims, primarily through a mainland effort in raising cash contributions.

Vicki Dapena, a resident of Bethesda, and sister of Ponce Mayor, Jose Dapena, spearheaded the group.

The Ad Hoc Committee stressed that funds raised will be shared equally by both organizations. In addition, Unidos de Puerto Rico has pledged that 25 percent of its funds being raised in Puerto Rico will be handed over to the Red Cross for the immediate emergency needs of the victims.

In addition to the fund raising effort, the Ad Hoc Committee announced that a memorial mass will be held this Sunday (October 20, 1985) at 2:00 p.m. at the National Shrine of the Immaculate Conception. It will be celebrated by His Excellency Alvaro Corrada del Rio who was recently installed as the first Hispanic Auxiliary Bishop in the Washington Roman Catholic Archdiocese. He is a Jesuit born in Puerto Rico.

Members of the Ad Hoc Committee emphasized the fact that cash and contributions in the form of checks is the easiest and most effective way to help in the massive relief effort now underway. Temporary housing and other emergency needs must be met quickly to aid in housing and resettling victims.

The response to help Puerto Rico in the Washington area and vicinity, the Ad Hoc Committee said, was overwhelming.

With more than 3.2 million American citizens, Puerto Rico was declared a Federal disaster area last Thursday, a decision which will help provide assistance to give direct aid to thousands of victims made homeless by the massive flooding and earthslides which made this Puerto Rico's worst disaster of the century.

The Ad Hoc Committee has solicited and received the support of the Resident Commissioner from Puerto Rico in Congress, Hon. Jaime B. Puster, the Puerto Rico Federal Affairs Administration in Washington which represents the Governor of Puerto Rico here, the Washington Office of the City of San Juan, Puerto Rico, the Republican National Hispanic Assembly, the Hispanic branch of the Democratic National Committee, LULAC (League of United Latin American Citizens) and scores of individual Puerto Ricans living in the Washington area, many of them Federal employees who have pledged their support of the volunteer effort.

#### MICHIGAN MINORITY SMALL BUSINESS PERSON OF THE YEAR

#### HON. HOWARD WOLPE

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 17, 1985

Mr. WOLPE. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to congratulate Mr. Joseph Gibbons of Kalamazoo upon being named Michigan Minority Small Business Person of the Year.

Starting with an investment of only \$5,000 in 1980, Joseph and Bridgette Gibbons have developed J & B Computer Product Center Inc. into an enterprise with sales of over \$2.5 million in 1984.

Joe Gibbons laid the groundwork for success as an entrepreneur through an illustrious career with the IEM Corp. After his graduation from Calvin College and 2 years as a social worker in New York City, Joe

joined IBM's Wall Street office in computer supplies and accessories. Joe moved from sales trainee in 1974 to president of the IBM 100 Percent Club receiving honors as the top salesman in the Nation in 1977. Joe continued along the fast track the following year by being promoted to product advisor and soon thereafter moving up to area manager for a six State region with revenue responsibility for \$40 million in sales.

Joe's wife, Bridgette Gibbons, has played a major role in the success of J & B Computer Product Center Inc. As a graduate of Western Michigan University, Bridgette gained valuable business experience carrying responsibility in the purchasing department of Clark Equipment Co.

As the result of much hard work in the implementation of a carefully devised business plan, J & B Computer Product Center Inc. has received numerous accolades from the business community.

Mr. Speaker, I would draw the attention of my colleagues to the following Kalamazoo Gazette article that provides the recognition for hard work and success that Joe and Bridgette Gibbons so richly deserve.

#### GIBBONS WINS STATE HONOR

(By Kathy Jennings)

Joseph Gibbons, chief executive officer of J & B Computer Product Center Inc. in Kalamazoo, has been named Michigan Minority Small Business Person of the Year.

The U.S. Small Business Administration award is given as part of national Minority Enterprise Development Week, which takes place next week.

J & B Computer Product Center, 728 W. Michigan, started up five years ago with two employees and a \$5,000 investment. It now has 19 employees and 1985-86 sales are expected to exceed \$5 million, Gibbons said today.

"J & B Computer is an example of the minority-owned firms that have emerged as a dynamic force in the marketplace," said Raymond Harshman, Michigan district director of the SBA. "Joseph and his wife Bridgette's success shows how resourcefulness and perseverance can result in an outstanding business."

Joseph Gibbons is chief executive officer of the firm and Bridgette Gibbons is president. In 1982 they moved the company to Kalamazoo from Chicago. The company sells computers, software and accessories to both small businesses and large corporations such as the Kalamazoo-based Upjohn Co. and the Oldsmobile Division of General Motors Corp.

As winner of the Michigan award, Gibbons is eligible to compete with other state winners for the national SBA award.

Joseph Gibbons said today he is "thrilled" to be recognized by the SBA.

"We are just trying to do a good job," he said. "We try to take care of our business, control our growth and build customer loyalty. To be recognized for that—when you are just doing your job—that is an extra."

Factors considered by the SBA in granting the award include an evaluation of the firm's growth, net profit and sales. Product quality, management and the reputation of the firm also are evaluated by the SBA committee that selects the winner.

Nominations for the SBA award are made by companies and organizations throughout the state.

In granting the award, Harshman also cited Joseph Gibbons' involvement in community affairs and activities aiding in the advancement of minority businesses.

The SBA award will be presented at the Minority Enterprise Development Week awards banquet on Oct. 8 at Cobo Hall in Detroit.

Gibbons is president of the Southwest Michigan Minority Business Development Association. He also served on the state committee responsible for recommending changes in the Minority Business Enterprise Division of the Department of Commerce.

Earlier this year, Gibbons was named Minority Vendor of the Year by the Michigan Department of Commerce. The minority vendor award is given to a business based on an analysis of its strength, growth, quality of products or service and its performance.

## WAR AGAINST DRUGS

### HON. ROBERT J. LAGOMARSINO

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 17, 1985

Mr. LAGOMARSINO. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues an editorial printed in *The Washington Times* on October 9, 1985. The editorial describes several of the accomplishments made by U.S. Federal law enforcement agencies involved in the war against drugs in this country. I commend the editorial. We must use every weapon available in the fight against this dangerous threat to the very fabric of our society.

#### TIDE IS TURNING AGAINST DOPERS

Much has been written about how we're losing the war on drugs, so why not give up and legalize drugs? And I smile. I smile because I know better.

From 1977 to 1979 I was a federal prosecutor in the U.S. attorney's office in Miami, Fla. In those days, that office consisted of approximately 25 lawyers. Interagency cooperation was nonexistent, the cocaine barons were secure in Colombia, drug traffickers openly carried large amounts of cash to the banks in paper bags, and in the movies, "high" was in. The drug problem was out of control. It was war—the greatest attack on the fabric of the American social structure that ever has been seen—and we were losing.

Then, in 1981, reinforcements arrived. President Reagan declared we were fighting back: "We're taking down the surrender flag that has flown over so many drug efforts; we're running up a battle flag. We can fight the drug problem, and we can win."

The administration promoted legislation and increased resources to mount the counteroffensive on the two fronts that are turning the tide: destroying the drug traffickers' top organizers and wealth, and educating the American public about the dangers of drug abuse.

The U.S. attorney's office in Miami is now the fourth largest in the country, with approximately 94 assistant U.S. attorneys. Interagency cooperation is routine. FBI participation in drug enforcement has increased federal drug investigative resources by about 50 percent. The formation of 13 Organized Crime Drug Enforcement Task

Forces in 1982 brought together the resources from nine federal agencies to fight drug trafficking, and state and local officers from more than 100 law enforcement agencies have participated in 44 percent of task force cases.

The extradition of major narcotic dealers from other countries is another sign that the tide has turned. For example, a treaty with Colombia now permits extradition of Colombian nationals to the United States for narcotics violations.

We also have mutual assistance treaties with numerous countries. The United States and the Cayman Islands recently negotiated an agreement that will allow access to Cayman banking information in certain criminal cases, particularly those involving narcotics. Italian and U.S. authorities have established a joint group to assist in narcotics organized crime investigations and prosecutions.

We're taking the profit out of drug trafficking. The Comprehensive Crime Control Act of 1984 allows seizure of all ill-gotten assets from drug smugglers including ranches, businesses, estates, works of art, and condominiums—not just boats, cars, and planes used to smuggle narcotics, as in the past.

First Lady Nancy Reagan also has been an invaluable help in the fight against drug abuse. She has given visibility to drug abuse awareness campaigns and been an eloquent champion in the effort to discredit the allure of drugs.

Not a day goes by without seeing in the newspapers a story about still another crackdown on major drug figures, or about marijuana plant eradication. The attorney general, himself, recently supervised one such eradication mission.

There is still much to be done, drug abuse remains, widespread. Yet the tide has turned, and the momentum is with us. The key is to keep the heat on.

Even the movies and television shows reflect this turn of events: the dopers aren't laughing anymore, as they did in the Cheech and Chong movies. Drug smugglers are portrayed more realistically now as ruthless murderers in "Miami Vice"—and now they're singing "The Smugglers' Blues."

## IMPROVING TECHNICAL EDUCATION

### HON. DOUG WALGREN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 17, 1985

Mr. WALGREN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to share with my colleagues an article written by Dr. Dale Parnell, president of the American Association of Community and Junior Colleges, in which he argues for higher education reform targeted toward improving education in technological fields.

Dr. Parnell makes a compelling case for improving technical education—compelling for this country educationally and economically—which I believe argues for H.R. 2353, my bill to create in the National Science Foundation a program to assist community colleges for this very purpose. I commend his article to my colleagues in the House.

## EDUCATING THE NEGLECTED MAJORITY

(By Dale Parnell)

Educational reform has been a hot issue in recent years. Teacher preparation, academic quality, the value of the humanities, and the quest to define an "educated person" have gained much national attention from educational and business leaders, the media, and elected officials—particularly our governors.

I believe we can sum up most of the reform reports with two words: substance and structure. More substance and more structure are required in the educational program, especially at the high school level. But this alone won't do it. Potluck in the schoolhouse is no longer sufficient for a quality education.

The recent educational reform reports and studies have overlooked one vital segment and one pressing problem in today's educational system—the middle 50 percent of our high school student body, a group I call "the neglected majority." These students often struggle to complete high school. They do not see much value or benefit in the high school diploma, and most of these students will not complete a baccalaureate degree. But they do need an excellent education.

The neglected majority represents a waste of our human resources, and our economic resources as well. These students could become the foundation of our technological work force, which is increasingly dependent on competent, liberally educated technicians.

Here are some startling facts that bring home the importance of addressing the needs of the neglected majority:

Eighty-three percent of the current adult population does not hold a baccalaureate degree. By 1990 that figure might decrease to 75 percent. But this still leaves three out of every four adult Americans without a baccalaureate degree.

Of 40 million elementary and secondary school students in this country today, 11 million will not complete high school.

Nearly two-thirds of all high school dropouts come from an unfocused general education program.

The 20 fastest-growing occupations in 1982-85 all indicated a preference for post-secondary education and/or training, but not necessarily a baccalaureate degree. The American Electronics Association reports a 60 percent increase in the need for technicians by 1987, or 115,000 new electronic technician jobs.

A recent Pennsylvania State University study found that 90 percent of the 1982 and 1983 entering college students expected a B average, while 61 percent estimated they would need to study less than 20 hours a week. Eighty percent said they knew little or nothing about their choice of major.

Three trends emerge in examining the issue of the neglected majority: the increasing need for competent and broadly educated technical workers; the wasted talent of our young people who do not complete high school or do not benefit much from high school; and the lack of continuity between high school and college curriculums.

I propose a new four-year "tech-prep" associate degree program that would parallel the college preparatory-baccalaureate degree track. We propose to make better use of the junior and senior years of high school in a coordinated, continuous four-year curriculum that would span grades 11 and 12



and two successive years in a technical, junior, or community college.

The program would combine a common core of learning and technical education and would rest on a foundation of basic proficiency in math, science, communications, and technology—all in an applied setting and measured by standards of excellence.

This tech-prep associate degree program would assure that the majority of our high school students who do not aspire to a baccalaureate degree receive a quality education. The program would also provide our economy and businesses with the trained and educated technicians they need.

Can high schools and colleges do something about the loss of continuity in learning? Can cooperative effort and cooperative programming help make winners out of ordinary students? Can the tech-prep associate degree program provide more structure and substance for students not on the college preparatory track?

The answer to all these questions is, and must be, yes. Either we will help our ordinary students develop the competencies to function as independent and productive citizens, or later we will pay the bills for not doing so. We will invest in developing our human resources now, or we will waste these precious resources and thereby diminish the capacity of individual lives and the strength and vitality of our nation.

**THE 10TH ANNIVERSARY CELEBRATION OF THE EXECUTIVE ADMINISTRATION OF THE UNIVERSITY OF MARYLAND EASTERN SHORE'S CHANCELLOR, WILLIAM PERCY HYTCHE**

**HON. ROY DYSON**

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 17, 1985

Mr. DYSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to Dr. William Percy Hytche, chancellor of the University of Maryland Eastern Shore.

On October 19, Dr. Hytche will be honored in a special celebration commemorating his 10 years of dedicated and distinguished service to the University of Maryland Eastern Shore. Because of Dr. Hytche's sound judgement and creative vision, the university continues to grow and prosper.

Dr. Hytche, who was born and raised in the Porter, OK, area, earned his B.S. degree in mathematics at Langston University and his M.S. and Ed.D. degrees at Oklahoma State University. He has also studied at Oklahoma University, Oberlin College, University of Wisconsin and the University of Heidelberg in Heidelberg, West Germany.

After serving in roles as instructor, assistant professor, associate professor, professor, chairman of the department of mathematics and computer science, dean of student affairs, chairman of the division of liberal studies, and director of a major Federal program, Dr. Hytche was recognized for his administrative abilities by university officials and the board of regents and was appointed chancellor in 1975.

Dr. Hytche is a man who has done much to improve the quality of life in his com-

munity. For college students and colleagues alike, Dr. Hytche's wisdom, wit, and compassion is well known.

More than anything else, Dr. Hytche considers himself an educator. And nowhere has Dr. Hytche's commitment to excellence been more evident than in his record as a teacher. While teaching in the Ponca City, OK, school system, Dr. Hytche received the Outstanding Teacher of the Year Award. In addition, he has been honored with the title, Most Outstanding Administrator while serving in the U.S. Army Corp of Engineers, as well as Outstanding Faculty Member of the Year at the University of Maryland Eastern Shore in 1966.

Chancellor Hytche's enormous contribution to the State of Maryland is deeply appreciated. It is with a sense of great pride, Mr. Speaker, that I offer these few words of honor to such an outstanding individual.

**ENDOWMENT FOR DEMOCRACY  
PRAISED BY AFL-CIO**

**HON. JIM COURTER**

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 17, 1985

Mr. COURTER. Mr. Speaker, when the executive council of the AFL-CIO met for several days in Pittsburgh in August, they released a statement expressing their view of the importance of the National Endowment for Democracy. They view the Endowment as I do—an exemplary wedding of private initiative and public moneys toward the end of fostering democracy and freedom abroad.

Please allow the RECORD for today to include the text of the AFL-CIO statement.

STATEMENT BY THE AFL-CIO EXECUTIVE COUNCIL ON NATIONAL ENDOWMENT FOR DEMOCRACY

In November 1983, Congress authorized funding for the National Endowment for Democracy, a private organization established to assist labor, business, the political parties, and other non-governmental agencies to help their counterparts in other countries to strengthen democratic institutions, promote human rights, and foster pluralism.

Having observed the work of comparable organizations in Europe, the AFL-CIO actively participated in the studies that led to the creation of the Endowment, and we strongly urged congressional support for it. We continue to believe that private-sector efforts on behalf of democratic institution-building abroad are vital to a foreign policy centered on human rights.

Our decades of work with trade unions abroad have convinced us that non-governmental institutions can be more effective in promoting freedom of association than governments, which may find it expedient to subordinate human rights concerns to other objectives.

The Soviet bloc allocates enormous funds and personnel to influencing the international labor movement and other private-sector institutions. While NED's resources are tiny compared to the funds expended by the totalitarians, they substantially enhance the ability of U.S. democratic forces to respond to this challenge.

Yet NED has encountered strong resistance from both ends of the political spectrum, where isolationism runs strong. Some on the Right oppose NED on budgetary grounds; some on the Left see aiding democratic institutions in other countries as a form of interventionism.

The AFL-CIO rejects both of these views. Our own democratic institutions cannot survive in isolation. Freedom of association cannot be secure here if it is snuffed out in the rest of the world. Nor can peace be assured in a world in which ordinary people lack the means of expression and organization to influence their leaders.

The AFL-CIO therefore reiterates its support for the National Endowment for Democracy and urges the Congress to provide funds commensurate with the urgency and scope of the Endowment's purposes.

**FOURTH ANNIVERSARY OF THE  
SOUNDVIEW HEALTH CENTER**

**HON. JAMES H. SCHEUER**

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 17, 1985

Mr. SCHEUER. Mr. Speaker, the Soundview Health Center, located in Bronx section of my district, will celebrate its fourth anniversary of operation at a dinner on Saturday, October 19, at Mauro's in the Bronx. This center has filled a critical health and social services void in the south-central Bronx. I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues a few facts about the center's work in the hope that it may serve as a model for other community health centers throughout the Nation.

From its beginning in 1981, the Soundview Health Center's goals, objectives and philosophy have been determined by the specific needs of the community it serves. The center has established an outstanding reputation by providing first-rate, family oriented health care. Its unique clinical model, caring administration and dedicated board of directors have succeeded in making the center a shining example for health care institutions throughout New York City and our Nation.

The Soundview Health Center, which speaks to the need for cost-savings without compromising the quality of health care, has won recognition from organized labor unions such as District 37 of the American Federation of State, County and Municipal Employees, the New York State Department of Health, and the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services. Despite a general atmosphere of nonsupport for health and social programs of this type, Soundview Health Center has proved to be a worthy provider for Bronx residents.

I would like to take this opportunity to commend the individuals who have been the driving force behind this excellent institution: Edward Gibbs is chairman of the board of directors, Pedro Espada serves as the center's executive director, Dr. Neil Calman is medical director, and Sandra Love is its community affairs director. These are the people who are responsible for the center's ability to provide dependa-

ble, low-cost and quality health care for the residents of the Bronx and I commend them for their dedication and hard work.

Under the able leadership of the Comprehensive Community Development Corporation, I am confident that the residents of the Bronx can look forward to even better care for human needs from the Soundview Health Center in the years ahead.

#### H.R. 1409, MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AUTHORIZATION BILL

**HON. BERKLEY BEDELL**

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 17, 1985

Mr. BEDELL. Mr. Speaker, when the House considered the fiscal 1986 military construction authorization bill, H.R. 1409, yesterday, I did not offer two amendments I had proposed earlier. However, as one who has been and will remain active in seeking reforms of current procedures for Federal procurement of architectural and engineering [A/E] services, I believe two issues merit further investigation by Congress.

First, I remain opposed in principle to any ceilings on the size of A/E contracts that are set aside for small businesses. Rather, proper industry size standards set by the SBA are the best way to ensure that small businesses receive a fair share of contracts and dollars. There is overwhelming statistical evidence that the small business set-aside program for A/E military construction contracts is not helping small businesses the way Congress intended. The set-aside program has been gutted by a restriction that arbitrarily suspends the Small Business Act. This restriction is a ceiling of \$85,000 on the size of individual A/E contracts that can be set aside for small businesses. Because of recent action by the SBA to lower the A/E size standard, and because I am hopeful that the DOD will propose raising the \$85,000 ceiling, I did not offer my amendment to repeal the ceiling concept at this time.

Second, on a completely different issue, the Office of Federal Procurement Policy [OFPP] has recommended that Congress authorize a limited program to test alternatives to current Brooks Act A/E source selection procedures. The OFPP's recommended alternative is quite modest and deserves a try. Of all negotiated Federal procurement, procurement of A/E services is the only place where the Government gives so little consideration (and so late in the process) to the price of the services it is procuring. While I remain, as always, strongly opposed to any selection procedure based solely or primarily on price, I do think that we have a responsibility to the taxpayers to see that price receives some consideration. Because I am hopeful that further hearings will be held on this matter, I did not offer the amendment I had proposed that would have implemented the OFPP's recommendations.

Neither of these proposals is my idea, and neither of them is a new idea. Rather,

they were recommended in reports to Congress by the Department of Defense and the Office of Federal Procurement Policy. These reports were required by legislation enacted by the Armed Services Committee and by the Government Operations Committee respectively. Both concepts were also supported by the comprehensive study by the Commission on Government Procurement.

#### SMALL BUSINESS SET-ASIDES

These are 15,250 firms in the general construction area of the A/E industry, which excludes naval A/E. According to the most recent Department of Defense (DOD) statistics, the very largest 1.5 percent of firms (i.e. 250 firms) in this industry are now receiving 18 percent of contract awards, and 31 percent of the contract dollars awarded. Due to a provision inserted by the Senate in the fiscal 1985 Military Construction Act (Public Law 98-407), the percentage of contracts and contract dollars that is set aside for competition among small businesses has been cut in half in the last year. Section 808 of that act provided that no A/E contract that is estimated to exceed \$85,000 will be set aside for competition exclusively among small businesses. In practice, DOD does not set aside contracts over \$55,000, for fear that they might exceed the threshold amount after later modifications.

Many of the largest firms in the A/E industry supported imposition of this \$85,000 ceiling because they believed that the Small Business Administration was defining some rather large firms as "small." These firms were then eligible for small business set-asides. I and the House Small Business Committee have long shared the view that the size standard for a "small" A/E firm is far too high. In fact, the Small Business Committee held hearings recently on the failure of the SBA to set proper size standards in some industries. Those hearings focused on size standard reform legislation, H.R. 1178, introduced by Small Business Committee Chairman Parren Mitchell. Chairman Mitchell has indicated that the committee may mark up H.R. 1178 this fall, and I assure the House that the Small Business Committee will continue to act to achieve proper size standards in all industries.

Regarding the A/E size standard, I was pleased that the SBA proposed on September 16, 1985 that the size standards be lowered from \$7.5 million and \$3.5 million in average annual billings (for the engineering and architectural industries respectively) to \$1.5 million. Although I think that the SBA has now proposed a standard that may be too low, I am pleased that the issue is finally being addressed.

It would now be appropriate to repeal the \$85,000 ceiling on contract size. The section of law that imposed this threshold amount authorizes the Secretary of Defense to revise the threshold amount effective October 1 of this year in order to ensure that small businesses receive a fair share of A/E contracts. I am hopeful that DOD will propose a higher ceiling for fiscal year 1986, and I will not offer my amendment to repeal the threshold amount concept at this

time. However, I remain opposed to this entire approach to small business set-asides. So does the Department of Defense. Public Law 98-115, the Military Construction Authorization Act, 1984, directed DOD to conduct a comprehensive review of its A/E procurement program in order to determine whether current law results in a fair distribution of contracts to firms of all sizes. In his report to Congress, Secretary Weinberger stated, "The establishment of a 'reasonable threshold amount' will not result, in our view, in 'reasonable share distribution.' We believe that an appropriate size standard will accomplish that objective."

#### THE BROOKS ACT

In 1967, the U.S. General Accounting Office GAO ruled that the Government's traditional method of selecting A/E firms did not comply with the statutory mandate for "competitive negotiations" because price was not a factor. Enacted in response to this ruling and with the stated purpose of making A/E procurement more competitive, Public Law 92-582—the Brooks Act—essentially codified the traditional method of A/E selection. It prohibits the consideration of price until the Government has chosen the firm with which it will first negotiate. In 1972, the Commission on Government Procurement recommended that price be considered as a secondary factor in A/E source selection. In 1976, the GAO found that Public Law 92-582 had not made A/E procurement more competitive and recommended that the Government award A/E contracts on the basis of the best value in terms of design performance and life-cycle cost.

In January 1985, a report by OMB's Office of Federal Procurement Policy [OFPP] that was required by the Competition in Contracting Act recommended a very limited program to test alternative selection methods. The OFPP recommended that the three "most qualified" firms would be given a detailed briefing on the proposed project, and then invited to submit technical and price proposals simultaneously in separate envelopes. The technical proposals would be opened first and ranked on the basis of technical merit, then the cost proposals would be opened and matched with the technical proposals. The government could then select the technically top-ranked firm if it clearly represented the best value, or—failing successful negotiations with the top-ranked firm—could negotiate with the next-highest ranked firm. The Department of Defense has also indicated that a test program would be appropriate.

I would like to make it clear that I remain strongly opposed to any A/E selection procedure based solely or primarily on price. I believe that the OFPP proposal addresses the legitimate concern that engaging the services of an experienced design professional is very different from buying spare parts.

As former House Government Operations Committee Chairman Chet Holifield wrote in his dissent to the Brooks Act committee report in 1972, "Great fears have been ex-



pressed that, if competitive proposals are required for each project, then the competition will inevitably become one of price bidding; and that the Government, in consequence, will be driven to select the inferior firm with the lowest offer at great risk to the quality of performance. The argument frequently is cast in terms of advertising for sealed bids. In my opinion this is a complete bugaboo." No one is suggesting, " \* \* \* that professional services of this kind be purchased through advertising and sealed bids. \* \* \* The real point is that, unless the Government has an opportunity to receive and evaluate competing proposals for the best way to get a job done, it will not be able to assure itself that the public interest is fully served."

#### CUBA SAID TO JAIL ACADEMIC, UPSETTING THE FRENCH

##### HON. GUS YATRON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 17, 1985

Mr. YATRON. Mr. Speaker, I want to take this opportunity to discuss the human rights situation in Cuba. Despite all of Castro's proclamations regarding improved conditions in his country, the human rights of Cuban citizens are denied by his government. In addition, this Communist economy is probably as bad as ever. Communism has been an abysmal failure in Cuba, and this fact should serve to remind us how precious the freedoms and liberties we enjoy truly are.

The Cuban American National Foundation has done an outstanding job in keeping Members apprised of developments in Cuba. This organization recently provided me some articles discussing political prisoners in Cuba. I want to submit one of the articles for the benefit of all of our colleagues. As chairman of the Subcommittee on Human Rights and International Organizations, I will continue to actively promote respect for fundamental human rights in Cuba.

The article appears as follows:

[From the New York Times Sept. 29, 1983]

CUBA SAID TO JAIL ACADEMIC, UPSETTING THE  
FRENCH

(By John Vinocur)

PARIS, September 29.—Cuba has arrested the former vice rector of the University of Havana after promising France that he would be allowed to leave the country, French officials say.

The arrest last Saturday of Ricardo Bofill has caused considerable irritation and some embarrassment to the Socialist Government, which has sought to maintain good relations with the Castro regime. Three of President Francois Mitterrand's Cabinet ministers have traveled to Cuba in the past year, and the possibility of a visit to France by Fidel Castro has been a recurring theme in the French press.

The case involves an attempt by Mr. Bofill to seek refuge in the French Embassy in Havana on April 29. While pursuing an unusually successful academic career, Mr. Bofill became disillusioned with the Castro

Government and was accused of belonging to an anti-Castro faction within the Communist Party. Since 1967 he has received two prison sentences and served more than seven years in jail.

According to his wife, who lives in Miami, Mr. Bofill went to the French Embassy because he had been threatened by telephone and his mail had been intercepted. Once he was there, she said in a telephone conversation today, the embassy was surrounded by security policemen.

Eventually, Mrs. Bofill said, the Ambassador, Pierre Decamps, spoke directly to Cuban Vice President, Carlos Rafael Rodriguez, who gave the Ambassador his "personal word of honor" that Mr. Bofill would be left alone and be allowed to leave the country quickly.

She said she knew nothing of his activities in the intervening period, but learned of his disappearance on Saturday and was told on Monday that he had been arrested.

#### NO CUBAN RESPONSE

On Tuesday Francois Gutmann, the second-ranking official at the Foreign Ministry here, summoned the Cuban Ambassador, Alberto Boza, to "request information in relation to the present rumors concerning Mr. Ricardo Bofill." The use of the word "rumors" was a diplomatic euphemism because French officials privately confirmed Mr. Bofill's arrest.

A spokesman for the ministry said today there had been no Cuban response to the request as yet.

French anger about the situation appeared linked to the fact that the Cubans had broken their word and apparently waited to arrest Mr. Bofill until Foreign Minister Claude Cheysson completed a planned visit to Havana in August. In addition to Mr. Cheysson, Transport Minister Charles Fiterman, a Communist, and Jack Lang, Minister Delegate for Cultural Affairs, have visited Cuba in the last 14 months.

The opposition press here has seized on the affair, and today *Le Quotidien de Paris* asked in a headline, "Did the French Embassy 'turn over' an anti-Castro opposition figure to the Cubans?" An earlier statement by the ministry of External Relations here said Mr. Bofill left the French Embassy of his own accord.

Last year the Socialist Government played an important role in obtaining the release from prison in Cuba of the anti-Castro poet Armando Valladares. This time, said Fernando Arrabal, the Spanish writer, who lives in Paris and has corresponded with Mrs. Bofill, the Government behaved with unusual naiveté.

#### A REPORT CARD IN REAGANOMICS AND AN ANALYSIS OF GRAMM/RUDMAN

##### HON. JOHN J. LaFALCE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 17, 1985

Mr. LaFALCE. Mr. Speaker, this morning Walter Heller gave some excellent testimony at a hearing of my Subcommittee on Economic Stabilization. We had asked him to come in to share his views on issues of equity and growth for U.S. economic policy.

Professor Heller showed that since 1980 there has been a very substantial increase in the number of persons living in poverty and an unprecedented shift of income away from the poor toward higher income groups. He also documented how net investment by Americans is running at its lowest level since the 1930's and how the 1980 corporate tax cuts have not raised investment. Finally, he criticized the Gramm-Rudman proposal on grounds of economic soundness, defense preparedness, and equity. I would like to introduce his very eloquent statement into the RECORD.

#### TITLE: "A REPORT CARD ON REAGANOMICS"

Mr. Chairman, in inviting me to evaluate macro-economic policies in recent years in terms of equity, growth, and stability, you are in effect requesting a report card on Reaganomics. And while I cannot provide a comprehensive appraisal of President Reagan's macro-economic policies in the brief compass of this statement, I will try to highlight a few of the key impacts of the Reagan policies to date and the directions in which they are leading us.

#### EQUITY

Let me start with the question of equity and focus in particular on what is happening to the incidence of poverty and the distribution of income in the United States. The facts here are very clear, but unfortunately, Mr. Reagan labors under a misconception that is directly contrary to the facts.

Some time ago, he said "in the early '60s, we had fewer people living below the poverty line than we had in the later 1960s after the great war on poverty got under way. And there has been from that moment on a steady increase in the level of poverty . . ."

What are the established facts? The percentage of the population in poverty in 1959 was 22 percent, but the combination of steady growth in the 1960s coupled with the War on Poverty cut this in half by 1969, to 11 percent of the population.

The poverty rate then rose modestly during the slow growth of the 1970's, reaching 12 percent in 1980.

From 1980 to 1983 it rose by over 1/4, reaching 15.3 percent in 1983.

Under the impact of recovery, it declined to 14.4 percent in 1984. This translates into 33.7 million people living below the poverty line (\$10,609 in annual cash income for a family of four). Leaving aside the Reagan years, this is the highest rate since 1966.

One should note in passing that the official poverty rates, which I have been quoting, do not include non-cash benefits such as Medicaid, Medicare, food stamps, subsidized housing, and school lunches. The Census Bureau estimates that if all these benefits were included, the poverty rate would be 9.7 percent in 1984 if the non-cash benefits are counted at market value or 12.2 percent if they are counted at less than market value because of the lack of freedom of choice.

Turning to the distribution of income, we find that the shares of total money income received by families at different income levels remained remarkably stable throughout the post-war period. For example, the 20 percent of families at the bottom of the income scale received about 4 1/2 percent of total money income in 1947 and about 5 percent in 1980, while the top 20 percent received about 42 percent in both years. (The reduction in poverty was made possible by

economic growth, which lifted all the boats, and by government transfers.)

Since 1980, for the first time in the post-war period, the distribution of income has worsened. In 1984, the poorest 40 percent of all families got 15.7 percent of all income, the lowest share on record, while the share of the top fifth rose to nearly 43 percent, the highest share since 1948.

The severe recession and unemployment of the 1980's clearly had something to do with these numbers. But as the objective studies of the Congressional Budget Office, the Urban Institute, and other groups have shown, the combination of the Reagan budget cuts and tax cuts has cut the incomes of the poor and increased the incomes of the wealthy.

One hopes that Mr. Reagan will recognize these facts about poverty and income distribution. At stake is his low opinion, indeed, his ridicule of anti-poverty efforts by the government, and his evident willingness to train most of the fire power of his deficit-cutting efforts on social programs that particularly benefit lower income groups. This has been amply demonstrated by his recommended budget cuts so far and would be carried much farther under the Gramm-Rudman bill that he has enthusiastically endorsed.

At the same time, one should acknowledge that the Reagan tax reform proposals include a doubling of the personal exemption and increases in the standard deduction that would take almost all of the families now in poverty off of the income tax rolls. Whatever else is done or not done in the course of tax reform, one would surely hope that this move would survive. One should note in this connection that if the income tax exemption were converted from income into a credit against tax, the lowest income groups could be fully protected with a much smaller loss in revenue. The political problem is that in converting the exemption into a tax credit, even if the value were doubled for the lowest income brackets, upper middle and higher income groups would actually experience a reduction in the tax value of their exemption.

But beyond the adjustment of the income tax, if I perceive the thrust of the President's approach correctly, his answers to the damning numbers I've just reviewed would be, "Give us time. Our policies will boost savings and investment, thereby increase the supply capacity, productivity, and growth rate of the U.S. economy and generate jobs. All this will lift the poor out of poverty."

Clearly, in spite of last year's improvement, we have lost ground on poverty and income distribution in the 1980's. What about jobs? Unemployment, after rising to record post-war levels in 1982, dropped sharply in 1983-84. But it has been stuck at about 7 1/4 percent for a full year (sharply above the 5.8 percent rate in 1979, before the recession started). The modest rate of recovery in the past year has not only failed to reduce the official unemployment rate, but has led to an increase in the category of "discouraged workers" (now numbering 1,231,000) and made only a small dent in the number of part-time workers who would like full-time jobs (now numbering 5,551,000).

In response to these discouraging numbers, Reagan Administration supporters point out that 9 million new jobs have been created since 1981 and that the U.S. experience is in bright contrast with the experience in Western Europe, where unemployment averages near 11 percent of the labor

force. But to put this 9 million gain in perspective, one should note that the Administration argued in 1981 that its programs would create 12 million new jobs by 1986, 3 million more than if nothing was done. In other words, employment growth is achieving only the base-line level that the Administration projected would exist in the absence of its programs. In short, we should not let the "9 million new jobs" argument blind us to the huge residue of unemployment we still suffer from nor to the fact that we are falling grievously short of the targets the Administration set for itself in 1981.

#### SAVINGS, INVESTMENT, AND GROWTH

That leads us into the even thornier thickets of the Reagan savings and investment policies. For presumably, if the tax and other policies of the 1980's were generating a strong surge of investment in plant and equipment, research and development, and technological advance, the payoff in more and better jobs and higher living standards would not be too far off.

Lamentably, the evidence gives no aid and comfort to this hopeful view. Yes, we had a big spurt of business-fixed investment in 1983 and 1984. But now, not only has that fizzled in 1985, but analysis shows that our savings and investment record of the 1980's has been the poorest in some 50 years. The tax stimulants to saving and investment have been simply overwhelmed by the ravenous appetite of the U.S. Treasury for over half of net domestic savings needed to finance its deficits, its dissaving.

(In the ensuing discussion of savings and investment, I base my comments on the excellent statement made by Barry Bosworth of the Brookings Institution before the Congressional Joint Economic Committee on September 17, 1985.)

It is true that the monstrous 1981 tax cut gave a powerful demand-side thrust to the economy that lifted us out of the 1980-82 recession. But as a stimulus to supply, it has thus far been a failure. Largely through the mountainous federal deficit, the Reagan program produced a pattern of national saving and investment that has undercut, reduced rather than increased, the long-term growth rate of the U.S. economy. Instead of an investment boom, we have been on a consumer binge financed by the liquidation of our assets abroad, by a skyrocketing import surplus, and by the lowest rate of national savings and investment since the 1930's.

If this sounds shocking and implausible, one needs only to look at the facts to substantiate the foregoing conclusion:

The tax cut did not budge the net long-run private savings rate of about 8-9 percent of GNP. That is individual plus business saving minus replacement investment.

The gargantuan government deficit, or public dissaving, offset half of that. That is, half of all private saving had to be used to finance the budget deficit, with the result that the national saving rate fell from 8 percent to just over 4 percent last year.

To be sure, net investment stayed at about 7 percent of GNP, but that was made possible only by sucking in huge amounts of foreign saving.

New investment by Americans is at its lowest ebb since the 1930's.

With respect to the inflows of capital from abroad, none of us can be certain that those flows will continue at a clip of \$100 to \$130 billion a year. If that stream were suddenly to dwindle, it would boost U.S. interest rates and severely impact capital forma-

tion and housing. But letting it go undiminished means that our external debt would reach \$800 billion by 1990. At an average 10 percent rate of interest, that means an \$80 billion annual bill for interest and dividend payments to foreigners, a bill that could only be paid by shipping out goods and services at the expense of the American standard of living.

But, critics may ask, what about that 1983-84 surge in investment spending? Doesn't that show that the tax cut worked and the investment picture is healthier than I have just implied? Taking a closer look at that boom, one finds that 93 percent of the increase in equipment spending since 1979 is accounted for by office equipment (mainly computers) and business purchases of autos, (including small trucks). It is interesting to note that neither of these categories enjoyed a net cut in tax rates under the 1981 and subsequent tax acts.

The related point is that investment in American industrial capital has been steadily declining as a share of GNP. The benign impact of tax incentives has been swamped by the malignant impact of sky-high real interest rates, which in turn, trace back in large part to the huge federal deficit.

Before turning to the deficit, perhaps we should ask: Won't tax reform restore the incentive for capital formation? Part of the answer is obvious: We don't know, since we at this point don't know either the ultimate fate or the contours of tax reform. But beyond this, I think economists should admit that the tax system is so complex and has such a multitude of special provisions for different types of saving and investment, that for most changes, economists can no longer tell you for use whether a particular tax provision will in fact promote or discourage capital formation. What an economist can tell you is that cutting the federal deficit will increase national saving and private investment. Even here, one has to add, "provided that the cut in the deficit does not result in slowing down the economy as a whole through a reduction in demand."

#### THE DEFICIT AND GRAMM-RUDMAN

From the foregoing analysis, one can see that the massive deficits created by the largest tax cut in history coupled with the biggest peace-time defense buildup in history are defeating the very essence of Reaganomics by curbing the saving flow and thwarting the President's investment and growth objectives. Both by undercutting the rate of capital formation and by building up a huge foreign debt, these policies are also leaving a lean and bitter legacy for future generations that will have to do with a smaller capital base and a large liability for overseas debt services. Rudy Penner, the highly respected head of the Congressional Budget Office, calls it fiscal child abuse.

In this light, it seems strange that Mr. Reagan is so adamant in barring tax increases as part of the deficit-reducing package. Perhaps one has to go beyond crass anti-tax politics and economic analysis to psychoanalysis to understand his position. Deep down, the President must be clinging to the conviction—contrary to virtually all the evidence—that holding firm on the tax front helps squeeze down government spending, especially on social programs, in response to the excruciating pressures of the deficits. Senator Durenberger of Minnesota last month said that he's about to subscribe to the theory that "there is some deliberate intention to use deficits . . . to get



us to denationalize the financing of public services."

Ironically, it turns out that the huge Reagan tax cut, coupled with the big military buildup, is itself the greatest single source of non-defense spending increases through its impact on the public debt and interest rates. Net interest on the public debt has zoomed from \$43 billion in 1980 to a projected \$138 billion in 1986 and, at the present rate of increase, would reach over \$200 billion by 1991.

If Senator Durenberger is on the track in his assessment, it may explain why President Reagan has so enthusiastically embraced the Gramm-Rudman proposal for ending the deficit by a series of lock-step budget cuts. Since I testified on this proposal before the Joint Economic Committee last Friday and dealt with it in a commentary last evening on the Nightly Business Report on PBS, I would like, if I may, to offer these statements for the record. I will add only a few comments here.

The Gramm-Rudman formula is basically flawed in making no distinction between constructive deficits that can help the economy climb out of recession or overcome slow growth from destructive deficits that boost interest rates and undermine savings, investment, and growth. It fails to recognize the difference between the cyclical and structural components of deficits. Its weak-kneed provision for temporary suspension of its formula if a drop in GNP is forecast provides very little relief on this score.

Indeed, the Gramm-Rudman plan would send us on a mindless course (and also what even Senator Rudman has admitted is a gutless course) toward budget balance, no matter what economic, social, and military damage it might leave in its wake.

I yield to no one in my concern for bringing our monstrous budget deficit to bay. But unless the rigid and Draconian formula of Gramm-Rudman can somehow be transformed into a flexible but still Spartan plan to bring the deficit under control, I urge Congress not to fasten this ill-fitting straightjacket on itself.

#### ACCENTUATING THE POSITIVE

Let me now turn to a few more hopeful and even positive features of the macro-economic policy scene in Washington.

It is not too late to reverse course and exercise damage control with respect to the federal deficit. Its impacts are corrosive rather than explosive. It is not too late to shift or even reverse gears on curbing the deficit in a sensible way, coupling spending cuts with revenue increases and perhaps even removing the off-limits sign from social security. After all, a liberated David Stockman and an unrepentant Martin Feldstein, both ardent supporters of Mr. Reagan's, are urging him to open the doors to a tax increase. Indeed, Mr. Stockman said that what America needs is a good \$100 billion tax increase and "that the spending-cut episode is over."

And the new Director of OMB, James C. Miller III, sounded admirably flexible in his confirmation hearing when he said that "nothing is off-base, nothing is sacrosanct", went on to say that "some restraint in entitlement programs might well be looked at by the President and Congress", and did not even rule out tax increases as part of a budget package. Hope springs eternal.

Beyond this, we should give credit where credit is due on some of the more recent policy initiatives of the Reagan Administration that are both courageous and right-headed. Let me identify and applaud these

moves on several fronts and, as you might expect, let me also suggest some additional moves that would help achieve and consolidate the gains promised by these new approaches.

First, the Reagan administration under the leadership of the Baker Treasury, has at long last recognized that (1) in large part, our trade deficit and protectionist pressures trace to a sharply overvalued dollar and (2) that this country does not have to stand by like a helpless giant, granting what amounts to a subsidy to imports and imposing a penalty on exports. But the job is not yet done. The initial success of the Big Five intervention efforts should now be bulwarked by narrowing the wide gap between our unduly loose fiscal policy and huge deficits and the unduly tight fiscal policies of our trading partners.

Second, the combination of the Big Five initiative and selective White House concessions on trade has apparently blunted the most dangerous protectionist movement since the 1930's. Protectionist legislation will still emerge from Congress, yet President Reagan's moves have apparently gained enough backers in Congress to sustain his promised vetoes. But the job is not yet done. Now, to keep the protectionist forces at bay and make U.S. producers steadily more competitive, Washington policy makers need to join hands in raising revenues and cutting spending to shrink the deficit, boost savings, and lower interest rates.

Third, with the evident blessing of the President, the Federal Reserve has commendably been clearing the path to renewed expansion by running a monetary policy that facilitated a sizable drop in interest rates this year. But its job is not yet done. To keep expansion going, to bolster fragile financial markets here and abroad, and to facilitate the Big Five moves to realign the dollar, the Federal Reserve should maintain an easier money policy. Continued economic slack, low inflation, and the declining velocity of money provide a low-risk setting for such a policy.

Fourth, within the past year, bright hopes were kindled for tax reform to reduce the complexity and increase the fairness of the income tax and, above all, to enthrone market advantage rather than tax advantage as a guide to the flow of resources in the U.S. economy. Base-broadening and rate reduction were the watchwords. The promise was a bright one. But hopes for a tough and meaningful reform seem to be ebbing. So the job is far from done. Unless the reform process is revitalized, the mountain may labor and bring forth only a mouse.

Finally, even on the budget deficit, some progress has been made. Jousting with an adamant Congress that controls the Pentagon purse strings, the President has broken his lance. The pell-mell defense buildup is being brought within more reasonable bounds. And Congressional appropriations committees are hard at work trying to make a meaningful dent in the non-defense budget for fiscal 1986 and beyond. But to say that the job is not yet done is to put it very mildly.

## JIM WILDING RECEIVES DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION'S GOLD MEDAL AWARD FOR OUTSTANDING ACHIEVEMENT

HON. FRANK R. WOLF

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 17, 1985

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, I am extremely pleased to share with my colleagues today good news about an outstanding Federal employee at the Department of Transportation.

Today, Secretary of Transportation Elizabeth H. Dole conferred the Department's Award for Outstanding Achievement—DOT's gold medal—upon James A. Wilding, Director of the Metropolitan Washington Airports. She couldn't have chosen a finer recipient for this honor.

As the Representative of the congressional district where the only two federally owned and operated airports are located, I have worked closely with Jim Wilding since coming to Congress in 1981. He has always been the consummate professional, always open and willing to work together to achieve the best possible operation of Washington National and Washington Dulles International Airports for both the passengers who use the facilities and the people of the 10th District who are the airports' neighbors.

I offer my congratulations to Jim Wilding on behalf of the people of the 10th District of Virginia for a job well done. At this point in the RECORD, Mr. Speaker, I would like to share the statement Secretary Dole made today in presenting the DOT award to Jim Wilding.

STATEMENT PREPARED FOR SECRETARY DOLE  
PRESENTING THE DOT GOLD AWARD, OCTOBER 17, 1985

The Department's Award for Outstanding Achievement—our gold medal—is the highest award we confer. It recognizes superior achievement and outstanding leadership—unique performance by a truly exceptional individual.

This year's recipient is Jim Wilding, Director of the FAA's Metropolitan Washington Airports. For the last 6 years, he has done an extraordinary job of managing National and Dulles Airports—the only two air carrier airports owned and operated by the federal government.

Jim has spent his entire career with the airports, beginning in 1959 as an engineer working on the planning, design, and construction of Dulles. He is now seeing those plans come to fruition—in no small part due to his own efforts over the years—as the number of carriers and traffic at Dulles is expanding at an historic rate.

In recent years, he has been in the middle of our efforts to develop a comprehensive operating policy for Dulles and National. More recently, he has provided invaluable counsel and enthusiastic support to our efforts to transfer the airports to an independent regional authority. He has shown particular concern for the future of his employees without whom the transfer will not succeed.

We are used to hearing about how much the government can learn from private industry. In Jim's case, it works the other way around. According to those that use Dulles and National, they are the most efficiently and competently run air carrier airports in the Nation. Under Jim's leadership the FAA employees at the Airports constitute the leanest, most efficient airport workforce in the Nation.

It's a great pleasure to present this year's Gold Award to Jim Wilding.

### TRAGEDY ENGULFS PUERTO RICO

**HON. MICHAEL D. BARNES**

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 17, 1985

Mr. BARNES. Mr. Speaker, from October 3 to October 7, 1985, torrential rains associated with tropical storm Isabel fell on Puerto Rico causing enormous destruction and hundreds of deaths on the island. At least 33 towns were affected, and a landslide near the southern city of Ponce resulted in the complete destruction of hundreds of homes. Puerto Rican authorities are still trying to unearth the remains of some 500 inhabitants of the barrio Mameyes who are unaccounted for. This is one of the greatest tragedies ever to affect Puerto Rico and the most lethal landslide in the history of the United States.

I would like to express my personal sympathy to Gov. Hernandez Colon and to the people of Puerto Rico in this difficult moment. As a supporter of House Resolution 293, I was pleased to learn that President Reagan has declared certain towns in Puerto Rico a disaster area, which will enable Puerto Rico to receive emergency assistance. In this time of mourning, the American people are already expressing solidarity with our brothers and sisters in Puerto Rico by making donations of food and clothing. But much more needs to be done in order to help in the reconstruction of the affected areas. I look forward to working with Gov. Rafael Hernandez Colon and with Resident Commissioner Jaime Fuster to find other ways in which all of us in the Congress can express our support for Puerto Rico in this tragic moment.

I also want to take this opportunity to encourage my colleagues in the Congress to learn more about Puerto Rico, its people, and its unique relationship with the United States. I have had the pleasure of visiting the island several times, and I am convinced that Puerto Rico is one of the most beautiful islands in the Caribbean. It was described by a famous Puerto Rican poet as "Borinquen, the pearl of the ocean." Its hard working people are responsible for creating what is known as a "development miracle" in the Caribbean. The neighboring island states admire Puerto Rico as a unique example of democratic government and economic growth and development. Nevertheless, Puerto Rico is also facing severe economic difficulties, which will be aggravated by the effects of storm Isabel. Therefore, it is our responsibility here in

the Congress not only to respond to this tragedy in the short term, but also to formulate long term strategies to help solve Puerto Rico's economic problems.

### MAKING THE UNITED STATES THE WHIPPING BOY: A CLEVER SANDINISTA TRICK

**HON. WM. S. BROOMFIELD**

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 17, 1985

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, the door is slowly closing on freedom for the people of Nicaragua. The Marxist-Leninist Sandinista Junta has just suspended more basic freedoms in that country. To justify these typically totalitarian decisions, Comandante Ortega blames the "devil up north," the United States of America. The Sandinistas are doing to the Nicaraguan people what all totalitarian governments do to their people. They are crushing the personal freedoms of those who want to live their lives as free human beings.

Just a few days ago, Daniel Ortega announced the suspension for 1 year of the following rights: to public assembly, to strike, to freedom of expression, to movement about the country, to organize into labor groups, to a speedy trial, to appeal convictions, to unwarranted detention, and to protection from unreasonable searches. These unfortunate actions are being justified as a response to Sandinista claims about sabotage by the United States, the activities of some political parties and the church which is allegedly allied with the United States.

The Sandinistas are building a police state and they cannot accept any form of dissent be it either from political parties or from the Catholic Church in that country. The Junta deals with dissent by tightening its control over the people by taking away the few basic human freedoms which still exist in that sad country. The truth behind this recent decision is that there is widespread disillusionment with the Sandinista regime by a large segment of the population. The Sandinista revolution has failed, and the people know it. The Sandinistas are growing fearful of their own people, and Uncle Sam is a convenient scapegoat.

Since coming to power in 1979, Comandante Ortega has both feared and opposed the church. On October 12, the Nicaraguan Government seized nearly all the copies of Iglesia, a new Catholic Church newspaper, along with the church's press and printing equipment. On October 15, the Sandinistas occupied the offices of the Catholic Church's social service agency, and refused to let the clergy enter. In late September, 11 seminarians were forced into military service despite their exemption from service in the armed forces. The Sandinistas fear the continuing support for the Nicaraguan church by the great majority of the Nicaraguan people who are fervent Catholics.

The Communist government there cleverly established a "Peoples' Church" which, I

understand, teaches far more political ideology than theology. A well-armed guerrilla fighter has replaced the traditional Christ figure hanging from the cross in that new church.

I urge the administration to continue its efforts to tell the world the truth about the real Nicaragua. It is not a peoples' paradise. It is slowly becoming another sad, oppressive and backward police state. Surely, the long-suffering people of Nicaragua and future generations there deserve more than this. It is Comandante Ortega, not Ronald Reagan, who has made Nicaragua what it is today.

With these concerns in mind, I commend the following Washington Post article to my colleagues in the Congress.

[From the Washington Post, Oct. 16, 1985]

#### NICARAGUA SUSPENDS RIGHTS

MANAGUA, NICARAGUA, Oct. 15—The government today suspended a wide range of civil rights and broadened a national state of emergency to fight what it called "sabotage" by the U.S. government and its allies within the country.

President Daniel Ortega, announcing the measures on a nationally televised broadcast, accused "agents of imperialism . . . within certain political parties, and the press and religious institutions" of supporting U.S. "terrorist policies" against his government.

The rights that were suspended cover the right to public meetings, to strike, to freedom of expression, to move about freely within the country and to organize into labor groups.

Nicaragua's revolutionary government first imposed a state of emergency, limiting most of these rights, in March 1982, saying it was necessary to fight U.S.-backed rebels seeking to overthrow it.

But the ruling Sandinista National Liberation Front had eased many of the restrictions before last November's election in which Ortega was elected to a six-year term.

Legal experts said the measures announced today permit police or other authorities to raid and search homes. They also suspend protection against unwarranted detention, the right to a speedy trial and the right to appeal convictions.

Today's suspension of rights will last for one year, Ortega said.

"The government cannot permit an activity of sabotage and political destabilization directed by the U.S. government to continue to develop with impunity," Ortega said.

Earlier Tuesday, security agents seized control of the offices of the Roman Catholic Church's printing press to prevent the publication of a new magazine, a church spokesman said.

Diplomatic sources said editors of the magazine had refused to submit to censorship.

### BRISTOL RETIRED SENIOR VOLUNTEER PROGRAM CITED

**HON. NANCY L. JOHNSON**

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 17, 1985

Mrs. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to publicly



recognize and commend the Retired Senior Volunteer Program [RSVP], sponsored by the Bristol Community Organization in Bristol, CT. Their effectiveness and popularity is evidenced by the fact that, established in April 1984, the number of volunteers has soared from an original 150 to the present 250-member enrollment.

The Retired Senior Volunteer Program is a nationwide network made up of retired senior volunteers, over age 60. These individuals share a lifetime of skills and experience, contributing their time to their communities. Many of these volunteer activities include services for the elderly such as adult day centers, nursing homes, homes for the aged, and hospitals. RSVP volunteers also serve in community programs for children and families, in schools, libraries, museums, health care agencies, nutrition programs, and recreational groups.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to represent such selfless volunteers who offer the benefit of their vast experience for the benefit of leaders of tomorrow.

#### THE 50TH ANNIVERSARY

### HON. WILLIAM F. CLINGER, JR.

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 17, 1985

Mr. CLINGER. Mr. Speaker, the Boalsburg Fire Co., located in Boalsburg, PA, is celebrating its 50th anniversary this year. The fire company was reorganized and chartered in 1935 and has been providing dedicated, professional, round-the-clock service to Harris Township, and at times, to surrounding communities. I know my colleagues join me in wishing the Boalsburg Fire Co. a happy 50th anniversary. Incidentally, two of the original charter members of the Boalsburg Fire Co., Montgomery Hubler and Frederick Lonberger, are still members of the company and at this time I want to say thank you to them for their many, many years of volunteer service to the community.

#### A TRIBUTE TO LOUIS A. RICCI, RETIRING BAND DIRECTOR OF ST. RITA HIGH SCHOOL

### HON. WILLIAM O. LIPINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 17, 1985

Mr. LIPINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I rise before my colleagues today to honor an outstanding resident of the Fifth Congressional District of Illinois, Mr. Louis A. Ricci. Mr. Ricci recently retired as director of the St. Rita High School Band in Chicago.

Mr. Ricci has been associated with St. Rita High School since 1954 and has served as band director since 1959. He is a 1953 graduate of St. Rita and received his bachelor of music degree from De Paul University. Under his direction, the Marching Mustang Band of St. Rita has risen to prominence throughout the Chicago area and

the Midwest. His bands have become famous for their spirited presentations at football games half-time shows, dedications, corporate conventions, collegiate and professional sports shows, and indoor concerts.

The St. Rita High School Band was crowned "City of Chicago Champion and No. 1 Class A Band in the 1983 Music Bowl Competition." The band won the Midwest first place trophy in the Michigan City, IN, Summerfest on three occasions in the 1960's. In 1963, they served as President Kennedy's honor band. They were the official band for the Chicago Cardinals football team during the 1950's and have appeared at several half-time shows for the Chicago Bears.

Mr. Ricci's main thrust was that of a teacher first and band director second. His Christian-like professional manner set an inspirational example to his students. He felt a deep obligation to the development of genuine work habits on the part of his students. Through music, Mr. Ricci knew a youngster could learn the importance of teamwork and application to the job at hand and therefore, gain experience that would sustain him for life. He would always remind his students, "You're only as good as your last show."

Along with his wife, Mary Fran, Mr. Ricci resides in the Midway area of Chicago. The Riccis have been married 27 years and are parents of one daughter and three sons.

Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pleasure to salute Mr. Louis Ricci on the occasion of his retirement from St. Rita High School and I join the residents of the Fifth Congressional District in thanking him for his outstanding work on our behalf.

#### MORE TERROR—AT HOME AND ABROAD

### HON. BENJAMIN A. GILMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 17, 1985

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, our satisfaction with the favorable turn of events as the President took decisive action to bring the Italian cruise ship pirates and murderers to justice is, as I said last week on this floor, mixed with continuing anger at continuing acts of terrorism here and abroad, which are so often unpunished.

Just last week, as the ship hijacking ended, two additional incidents of terrorism were brought to light.

In one incident, here in our own country, the offices of the National Association of Arab Americans was bombed, resulting in the tragic loss of one life and the wounding of several others. That bombing was outrageous and indefensible, coming as it does in our Nation, where free speech is treasured and respected above all other freedoms. As much as we may disagree with some of the statements of the NAAA, none of us may silence them by violence. Americans must use reasoned argumentation if

they think they are wrong, not the bomb or the bullet.

In Barcelona, Spain, last week, the decomposing bodies of two Israeli merchant seamen were found where they had been murdered. A Palestinian group took credit for killing "Zionist sailors". Again, shocking violence takes innocent lives.

I am certain that both the authorities in California and those in Spain will bend every effort to bring the killers—both those actively involved, and those who planned and assisted them—to justice.

Freedom from terror is indivisible. We must all join in condemning, in the strongest possible terms, every example of terrorism.

#### CONGRESSIONAL SALUTE TO THE HONORABLE DANIEL F. MALATESTA, P.E.&L.S. OF PA- TERSON, NJ, ESTEEMED CITY ENGINEER, COMMUNITY LEADER AND GREAT AMERI- CAN

### HON. ROBERT A. ROE

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 17, 1985

Mr. ROE. Mr. Speaker, on Sunday, October 27, the people of the city of Paterson, my congressional district and State of New Jersey will join together in testimony to an esteemed city engineer, outstanding community leader and good friend, the Honorable Daniel F. Malatesta, P.E.&L.S. of Paterson, NJ, who has announced his retirement as city engineer and director of public works of the city of Paterson to be effective November 1, 1985. I know that you and our colleagues here in the Congress will want to join with me in extending our deepest appreciation to Mr. Malatesta and share the pride of his good wife Elaine upon this milestone of achievement in their family endeavors.

Mr. Speaker, Dan's personal commitment to the economic, social, and cultural enhancement of our community has been a way of life for him. We are proud to boast that he is a lifelong resident of the city of Paterson and is licensed by the State of New Jersey as a professional engineer and land surveyor. He attended local schools and is a graduate of Paterson's Central High School. Upon completing land surveying studies at Bergen Junior College, he attended Seton Hall University at Stevens Institute of Technology. He received an Associate of Science Degree in Civil Engineering from the Newark College of Engineering and completed further courses of study in bridge and bridge construction at Hostra University.

Dan is a veteran of World War II, honorably discharged with the rank of staff sergeant. He commenced his engineering career pursuits in April 1949 as an engineer aide in the department of public works engineering department of the city of Paterson and advanced through the ranks to become street commissioner and acting city

engineer in 1972. During the following year he was appointed city engineer and in 1982 achieved his current high office of public trust as city engineer and director of public works for the city of Paterson.

Mr. Speaker, Mr. Malatesta has attained the greatest respect and deepest appreciation from a grateful community for his untiring endeavors in service to his fellowman. Among his vast constructive achievements we particularly commend him for his outstanding public service in the vanguard of many community development and improvement programs for the city of Paterson including—to name but a few—the following major public works projects:

Passaic River Basin flood relief projects affecting the Hillcrest area, Lakeview area, and Sandy Hill area.

Providing a master plan for wastewater collection.

Coordinating Federal and State reimbursements during flood disasters.

Major road construction, such as the Route 80 highway through Paterson, loop roadway around Paterson's downtown area, and other reconstruction projects.

We are especially proud of his leadership efforts in 1965 as director-coordinator of the Anti-Poverty Program to cleanup the Passaic River. This project utilized Federal funds with municipal personnel to cleanup the Passaic River.

Mr. Speaker, all of us who have the good fortune to know Dan Malatesta are proud to have had him on the team. He has played an important role in the achievement of government in his chosen field of endeavor. Professionals like Dan serve as the bulwark of strength in the day-by-day challenges of government in meeting the needs of our people. For a job well done there is no doubt that he has truly enriched our community, State and Nation.

As we gather together in tribute to his over three-and-a-half decades of personal commitment, quality leadership, richness of expertise, warmth of friendship and sincerity of purpose as city engineer and public works director of the city of Paterson, we do indeed salute a good friend, distinguished citizen, and great American—the Honorable Daniel F. Malatesta, of Paterson, NJ.

#### THE DEPOSITORY INSTITUTIONS EXAMINATION IMPROVEMENT ACT OF 1985

**HON. TIMOTHY E. WIRTH**

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 17, 1985

Mr. WIRTH. Mr. Speaker, I want to commend the authors of the Bank Examination Improvement Act of 1985 for the excellent job they have done in crafting this necessary and timely piece of legislation. The issues with which this legislation deals are very important for maintaining the soundness and stability of the financial system and the public's confidence in our financial institutions.

Last June, Dr. Henry Kaufman told the Subcommittee on Telecommunications, Consumer Protection and Finance that: "We are drifting toward a financial system in which credit has no guardian." He said—and many members of our subcommittee would agree—"It is unfortunate that the emphasis on monetarism and deregulation relegated supervisory agencies to a second and third level of importance." He believes, with the authors and cosponsors of this bill, "that the best people must be attracted to supervisory agencies through higher compensation and standards," and that the "importance of these responsibilities should be made known."

Mr. Speaker, there is widespread recognition that the provisions in this bill are a necessary step toward maintaining confidence in the financial institutions that play so vital a role in our Nation's economic life. I am very pleased to be a cosponsor of this legislation and, again commend its authors for the excellence and timeliness of their efforts.

#### REDEDICATION OF HENRY CLAY STATUE

**HON. GUS YATRON**

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 17, 1985

Mr. YATRON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues an important event occurring in Pottsville, PA, this Saturday, October 19, 1985. On this day, the elected officials and citizens of the city of Pottsville and the surrounding community will rededicate the statue of the great American statesman, Henry Clay. The statue was erected in 1855 and many people have contributed to its refurbishing.

The statue of Henry Clay has always been a source of community pride and a symbol of the respect, honor, and affection the people of Pottsville felt for its subject. How the statesman from Kentucky came to be a monument in Pottsville, PA, is an interesting story. History remembers Henry Clay for many extraordinary virtues of character and leadership. His oratory was renowned and he used it to great and memorable effect in the U.S. Congress in several terms as Speaker of the House and as a U.S. Senator.

In the early 19th century, the feeling of nationhood was still a new one for the American people and Clay's conception of the American system helped promote a sense of commonality and nationality. America's unity was tested more than once in Clay's lifetime. The fervor of his patriotism and nationalism and the great compromises he formulated contributed immensely to preserving the Union.

For Pottsville, however, it was Clay's efforts to protect American commerce and trade that are thought to be what made him most appreciated and esteemed. The importance of coal to Pottsville and the surrounding anthracite-rich region was para-

mount and Clay's dedication to the promotion of American industry certainly helped maintain the community's economic well-being.

As such, in 1855, 3 years after his death, the citizens of Pottsville erected the Nation's first monument to Henry Clay. The cast-iron statue is 15 feet high, weighs 7 tons, and stands on a 60-foot column which is itself mounted on a 12-foot base. The total height of the monument is 90 feet and it stands on a hillside in the city's southeastern sector.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to commend the citizens of Pottsville and Schuylkill County for their efforts to restore America's oldest and largest cast-iron monument and to preserve the history of their forefathers' admiration and affection for Henry Clay. Their 2-year long fundraising campaign is in itself a tribute to the city's sense of tradition and pride in its history and heritage. Congratulations to everyone involved and best wishes to the city for a wonderful parade and rededication ceremony on Saturday.

#### VICTORY OVER TERRORISM

**HON. BARBARA A. MIKULSKI**

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 17, 1985

Ms. MIKULSKI. Mr. Speaker, a brutal act of terrorism has taken another innocent American life. Mr. Leon Klinghoffer, an elderly man; an innocent man, known for his friendly smile and good-natured spirit, was murdered in coldblood last week by terrorists aboard the cruise ship *Achille Lauro*. The fact that Mr. Klinghoffer was confined to a wheelchair only dramatizes the cowardly nature of the terrorists who committed this terrible crime.

The whole world was shocked to learn that these terrorists made a deal with Egypt to get away. While Egyptian President Mubarak provided the terrorists with a plane flight out of Egypt, the United States planned to act swiftly.

Every American can be proud of President Ronald Reagan's resolve to bring these terrorists to justice. Our military forces showed courage and determination in carrying out a very difficult mission to intercept the plane carrying the terrorists. Our country stands tall because of our commitment to ensure that terrorists will not go unpunished.

The United States owes no one an apology for its action. There is nothing shameful in protecting the rights of the innocent civilians in the world. Let terrorists be on notice. Although others may be frightened by terrorist threats, the United States has the will and determination to stand up to terrorism.

We must ensure that Leon Klinghoffer did not die in vain. His murder has demonstrated to the world the true nature of terrorists. They are cowards who strike at the helpless and punish the innocent. Their tac-



tics are intimidation, disguised by cheap slogans justifying their thirst for violence.

Let the message be clear. The United States will never rest in its efforts to fight terrorism in all of its forms. The recent action by the U.S. military is a true symbol of victory over terrorism. This symbol will remain clear and strong.

### EAST-WEST CULTURAL GATHERING

**HON. HOWARD L. BERMAN**

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 17, 1985

Mr. BERMAN. Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday, October 15, the United States delegation to the Budapest Cultural Forum arrived in Hungary for the first East-West cultural gathering since the Helsinki Final Act was signed in 1975. I am honored to express my support for the goals of this forum and my hope for meaningful results.

As one in a series of experts' meetings mandated by the Madrid Review Conference of the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe, the Cultural Forum will bring together 35 participating states of East Europe, West Europe, and North America to discuss such issues as censorship, the sharing of creativity, persecution of cultural minorities, repression of religious groups, and the rights of journalists. A meaningful discussion of these issues will render a definition of culture among nations as well as within individual countries. Increased cultural exchange is a key element of the mutual understanding which is vital to the peace process.

The free exchange of ideas, however, cannot be realized as long as states continue to prohibit the language, religion, history, and literature of various ethnic groups. Despite constitutional guarantees of individual and cultural rights for all citizens in the Eastern bloc, the Soviet Union still rewrites the history of Russian and non-Russian peoples, restricts access to printed historical sources, and forces many non-Russian children into boarding schools where they will be separated from their parents and their culture. Soviet persecution of Jews and other religious minorities is a well documented horror. Czechoslovakia and Romania punish any display of ethnic diversity as an impediment to the desired national culture. In their constant effort to destroy cultural independence, Poland and the German Democratic Republic have attempted to overcome the power of the church. If these countries continue to ignore their own legal codes and blatantly violate human rights, what guarantee does the United States have that an international agreement will be adhered to?

With the summit meeting between President Reagan and Soviet leader Mikhail Gorbachev only 1 month away, the importance of the Budapest Cultural Forum is heightened. Unfortunately there has already been some disappointment as the Hungarian Government has severely cur-

tailed the activities of the International Helsinki Federation, a nongovernmental organization. This action demonstrates a clear lack of cooperation in an international effort specifically designed to combat such prohibitive practices. Moreover, it occurs at a time when a demonstration of respect for human rights would have a tremendously positive impact. Only through free interchange of ideas and unprohibited expression of culture can peace, cooperation, and security among states be realized.

### JOANN PENA RECEIVES COMMISSIONER'S CITATION AWARD

**HON. RICHARD H. LEHMAN**

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 17, 1985

Mr. LEHMAN of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commend and recognize a very special honor being awarded to JoAnn Pena, a supervisor in the Fresno Social Security Office in my district. Today, JoAnn will receive one of the Social Security Administration's highest awards, the Commissioner's Citation. This award is reserved for those who perform outstanding service to the disabled and aged community. I am very proud of JoAnn's achievements since she joined the Fresno Social Security Office in 1973. We are all aware of the difficulties Social Security recipients can confront when dealing with an agency as large as the Social Security Administration. Complaints are sometimes registered about the cold nature of the bureaucracy and the unnecessary red tape, however, JoAnn somehow manages to cut through it all and provide that rare personal touch. She is well known for her ability in breaking bureaucratic logjams and injecting a warm sense of humanity into the system. It is only appropriate that her superb work is being recognized today.

I know that JoAnn is truly appreciated by her colleagues, myself, my staff—who wouldn't know what to do without her—and most importantly, the hundreds of Americans in whose behalf she selflessly and tirelessly works for every day. JoAnn has given a great deal to the Fresno community through her hard work and for this I wish to extend my special thanks and my congratulations for receiving the Commissioner's Citation.

### CENTINELA CHILD GUIDANCE CLINIC CELEBRATES 30 YEARS OF SERVICE TO SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA

**HON. MERVYN M. DYMALLY**

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 17, 1985

Mr. DYMALLY. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to bring to the attention of my colleagues in the House of Representatives an accomplishment for which the people of my congressional district are deeply grateful.

Today, the Centinela Child Guidance Clinic of Inglewood, CA, will celebrate its 30th year of service to our communities. I have served all my time in Congress during a period of great restraint, a period of cutback upon cutback for services to those in our society who are most in need. It is with special thanks, therefore, that I join all friends of the clinic to rejoice in the fact that despite the impediments placed in its way, Centinela Child Guidance Clinic has continued to serve the mental health needs of our young people.

The goal of our clinic is simple and direct. It is to help as many children who have mental health needs as possible. Services are offered without regard to age, ethnicity, or income. Our clinic works toward its goal by maintaining a close and strong working relationship with all school districts, public officials, and related service agencies in our area. Centinela makes every effort to expand its services as needs dictate. Centinela is an outpatient facility that makes use of the most up to date clinical methods and practices available.

There are many groups to thank for the longevity of the clinic. Among those groups are the agencies which over the years have contributed to the financial survival of the clinic. United Way has been a significant contributor as have State and county governments. A myriad of individuals and foundations have also contributed to the mosaic of support. But I want to single out for special recognition the clinic's own efforts to maintain itself through its thrift store. I point this effort out especially because it is staffed by volunteers, by people who do their good work for the best reason of all: They care personally for the children of our community.

The highly competent staff of the clinic is led by executive director James Strong and by a board of directors whose newest members will be installed today at the Hawthorne Memorial Center. To them and to the many, many people who each have contributed to the spectacular success of Centinela Child Guidance Clinic, I express the gratitude of our community. May your efforts grow and prosper in the next 30 years so that our children might develop to the fullest extent of their mental and physical capabilities.

### THE 65TH ANNIVERSARY OF MONTEBELLO, CA

**HON. MATTHEW G. MARTINEZ**

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 17, 1985

Mr. MARTINEZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate the citizens of Montebello, CA on their city's 65th anniversary. The city, named for its "Beautiful Hills," was incorporated on October 16, 1920. To commemorate the event, a citywide celebration, "city day," is planned for Sunday, October 20, 1985.

Montebello was the site of the original San Gabriel Mission, founded in 1771 and

relocated in 1776. Its largely agricultural economy was significantly diversified by the discovery of oil in Montebello during World War I. This discovery helped stimulate a major growth in the city's population.

Named a bicentennial all-America city in 1976, Montebello is a unique and vital community. The city has maintained a balance of residential, commercial, and industrial development. Its diverse population consists of many of the groups who have come to southern California over the years seeking economic opportunities as well as political freedom. These groups have contributed tremendously in making Montebello a culturally rich community.

Montebello is a full-service city. It is one of the few communities in Los Angeles with its own city bus lines. Montebello has long been a leader in providing services to older residents. Under the leadership of Mayor Art Payan and the Montebello City Council, many citizens participate in local government activities.

I salute the citizens of Montebello, the city of "Beautiful Hills," as they celebrate Montebello's 65th anniversary and look forward to a bright future. I am confident they will be even more successful meeting the challenges of the next 65 years.

### THE CLARK FAMILY FARM SESQUICENTENNIAL

#### HON. BILL SCHUETTE

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 17, 1985

Mr. SCHUETTE. Mr. Speaker, the Clark family farm in Clinton County, MI recently celebrated its 150 years of production. I commend the Clark family for 150 years of hard work and dedication. Farming is not an easy way of life, and this family deserves special recognition for keeping the Clark farm in production for these 150 long years.

As the State of Michigan nears its 1987 celebration of statehood, this farm will be a reminder of the great agricultural heritage many Michigan residents share. We can look with pride at our hard-working forefathers who left the East to travel to the unknown farmlands and wilderness of Michigan.

Thank you, Clark family, for reminding our Nation of its great agricultural heritage.

### JAPANESE AMERICAN NATIONAL MUSEUM

#### HON. ROBERT T. MATSUI

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 17, 1985

Mr. MATSUI. Mr. Speaker, I rise to call to the attention of the House of Represent-

atives a gala dinner and inaugural fundraiser for the Japanese American National Museum. The event will take place in Los Angeles on the evening of October 18.

The Japanese American National Museum, in the words of its founders, has as its chief mission the documentation and preservation of artifacts which record the Japanese-American experience in America. The museum will create a greater understanding of the Japanese American social and cultural heritage, its contributions to and accomplishments as participants in the American historical experience.

The museum will accomplish its mission through programs of permanent and changing exhibitions, traveling exhibits, and educational activity based on its archival collections. Publications and multimedia events will comprise a continuing element of the museum's programs.

On September 24, SB 1452 of the California State Legislature was signed into law appropriating \$750,000 from the special account for capital outlay to the department of parks and recreation for allocation to the city of Los Angeles for the Japanese American National Museum. The appropriation is contingent upon \$1 million being raised from non-State funding sources. With the support of the community the inaugural fundraiser will be a major step forward toward that \$1 million goal.

Mr. Speaker, I commend those whose efforts have made the inaugural fundraising evening for the Japanese American National Museum a reality.